

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 February 2024

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/K3605/D/23/3333666
11 Pelhams Walk, Esher, Surrey KT10 8QA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr A Hussein against the decision of Elmbridge Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. 2023/1577, dated 5 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 20 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a front boundary wall with associated pillars and two pairs of 1.5m high gates.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework was published in December 2023, but there are no material changes relevant to the substance of the appeal.
3. The description of proposed works as set out within the planning application form and the Council's Decision Notice refer to the scheme being retrospective in nature. I noted on my site visit that the front boundary wall and piers had been erected, broadly in accordance with the submitted plans, but the gates had not been hung. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located within a private residential street comprising large, detached houses set in generous grounds with a mixture of front boundary treatments; but predominantly comprising soft landscaping, sometimes with low brick walls. In contrast, what has been built at the appeal site, comprises high, black rendered piers with lower intervening walls. It is also proposed to install high metal railed gates of a contemporary design.
6. I have had regard to the planning permissions granted at 2 and 15 Pelhams Walk, with regard to the former, the boundary treatment combined with that opposite at Pelhams, constitutes the gateway into the road and is of a distinctly

different character being adjacent to Lammas Lane. With regard to those at no 15, whilst it not appropriate for me to comment on the acceptability of these or otherwise, in their favour they would be of a lower height and of a more traditional design, ultimately however each case must be assessed on its own merits.

7. Whilst in itself the proposal would not look unduly out of place, bearing in mind they would be set against the backdrop of the host dwelling with its black windows, shutters, front door and balcony, it cannot be viewed in isolation and would appear stark in its appearance within the street and its aforementioned predominant character.
8. I consider that the site is in quite a visually prominent location, particularly when approaching the site from the north east where the road begins to rise up quite steeply once around the bend. For the reasons given above, I consider that the proposal, by virtue of its overall design and appearance would create an incongruous form of development within the street scene contrary to Policy CS17 of the Elmbridge Core Strategy July 2011 and Policy DM2 of the Elmbridge Local Plan Development Management Plan April 2015 which together require new development to deliver high quality design which integrates sensitively with the locally distinctive townscape whilst taking into account the design guidance set out within the Design and Character Supplementary Planning Document with regards to, amongst other things, appearance and scale.

Conclusion

9. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised by the appellant, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR