



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2024 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 SEPTEMBER 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Z5630/D/24/3345002

314 Tudor Drive, Kingston Upon Thames KT2 5QL

- 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 Baris Senli against the decision of Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames.
 - The application Ref is 23/03348/HOU.
 - The development proposed is 'Front boundary wall with columns, stone copings and railings'.
-

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 Matters

3. I saw on my site visit that the development has already commenced and appears to have been completed. Planning permission is therefore sought on a retrospective basis and I have made my recommendation on that basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The site is located on Tudor Drive, in an area known as the Tudor Estate Character Area. Tudor Drive mostly has semi-detached dwellings which are setback from the street behind front gardens. The front boundary treatments are predominantly formed of low brick walls of narrow depth which are unobtrusive in their appearance. The low brick walls are more often of a dark red colour which generally matches the colour of the brickwork at the ground floor of the dwellings that they are associated with. They are often combined with hedges and planting, which alongside the front gardens, grass verges and trees in the street, contribute to a spacious and verdant suburban character.
 6. The property has a wide frontage, and the boundary wall spans the full length of the front boundary. Its height and thickness appear noticeably bulkier and more dominant than the generally more modest and streamlined walls on the
-

street. This is emphasised by the tall, deep side profile of the brick columns. The materials including lighter red brickwork and beige stone copings are not complementary to the host dwelling or the wider street scene. The development does not therefore reflect the form, details or materials of typical front boundary treatments along Tudor Drive and is an incongruous feature in the street.

7. I have had regard to the examples provided of other front boundary treatments in the area, some of which I saw for myself on my site visit. The timber fence at 235 Tudor Drive opposite the site is a more natural material and combined with a low brick wall and hedge, it is better integrated within the street scene. The high brick wall on the corner of Park Road is itself a substantial feature. However, it is set away from Tudor Drive and its materials match those of its host dwelling. The other examples put forward by the appellant are generally not as bulky in depth or as substantial in width as the appeal proposal and are limited in number. They do not reflect the prevailing character and appearance of front boundaries on Tudor Drive.
8. I conclude, the development has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. In that regard, it conflicts with policies CS8 (Character, Design and Heritage) and DM10 (Design Requirements for New Developments (including House Extensions)) of the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames Core Strategy (2012) which require good design, seek to ensure developments recognise distinctive local features and character and respect, maintain or enhance the most essential elements identified as contributing to the character and local distinctiveness of the street.
9. For the same reasons, the development also conflicts with Policy Guidance 44 (Walls and Enclosures) of the Royal Borough of Kingston Upon Thames Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (2013) which states that walls and enclosures should respect the form and detail of other enclosures in the street so that new walls or enclosures do not appear out of character.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR