



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 April 2024 by C Glaister

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/L3625/D/24/3338034

33 Parkway, Surrey, Horley RH6 7HY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Bashford against the decision of Reigate and Banstead Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/01951/HHOLD.
 - The development is described as the retention of a side boundary fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The fence has already been erected and accords with the plans provided. Therefore, I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the fence on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. Parkway is a cul-de-sac containing semi-detached properties with relatively open frontages. Boundary treatments largely consist of low brick walls or open frontages, with some timber fences on boundaries between front gardens. These give the street an open and spacious character. Unlike the other properties on Parkway, No 33 has a rear garden boundary which runs alongside the road. Along the front of the appeal site is a section of older brick wall, consistent with other front boundaries in the street.
6. The appeal fence directly fronts the road, for which there is no pavement, and encloses an area which I am advised contained a grass verge. The fence is lower alongside the driveway but even this lower part is taller than the remaining section of brick wall.
7. The position of the fence adjacent to the road greatly reduces the open feel of the road in this area and makes it a prominent feature in the street scene. As a result, it is an intrusive and incongruous form of development which, because

of its height, materials, and position, is at odds with and harmful to the character and appearance of Parkway. Whilst cars may park alongside the fence and obscure some part of the fence, this does very little to mitigate the harm identified.

8. The appellant has referred to boundary treatments at other properties. The fences at Chantry Close, Oldfield Road, Sangers Drive, Hevers Avenue, and Smallfield Road are not within the vicinity of the site. They therefore do not affect or contribute to the character and appearance of Parkway. Each is also set back from the road behind a path, verge or both. The boundary treatment at the property on the corner of Park View is a brick wall set back from the road behind a wide grass verge. The fences which line the alleyway near the appeal site do not run alongside the road. The fence at 2 Chequers Drive is behind the footway, not on the edge of the road.
9. Consequently, none of these examples are seen in the same context as the appeal site, and do not have the same visual impact. Furthermore, I have no details of how those developments came to be built. They are therefore not comparable to the fence at the appeal site and do not justify the harm identified above.
10. Accordingly, the fence harms the character and appearance of the area. It therefore fails to comply with Policy DES1 of the Reigate & Banstead Local Plan Development Management Plan (September 2019) which seeks to ensure development respects the character of the surrounding area.

Other Matters

11. An absence of objections is a neutral matter which does not weigh in favour of the development. The ownership of the verge enclosed by the fence does not affect the merits of the case.
12. While I appreciate the need for security for the rear garden, there are likely to be other alternatives to create this without the harm identified here. I do not have details of the previous boundary treatment and whether the existing fence has resulted in improvements to privacy and security. Therefore, I can give this very little weight and it does not outweigh the harm identified above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. The development is contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations which justify granting permission. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Glaister

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and agree with the reasoning above. On that basis the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR