



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 December 2024

by Megan Thomas K.C. Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3630/D/24/3350297

2 Lynwood Avenue, Egham, Surrey TW20 9RD

- 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 Li against the decision of Runnymede Borough Council.
 - The application Ref. is RU.23/1844.
 - The development sought is front gate and piers, and brickwall/fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The development sought in the application has already taken place, however, that has not altered my approach to making the appeal decision.
3. The description of the proposed development on the appellant's application form was "new front gate and brickwork parapet wall". In the box heading above I have used the description of the proposal from the Decision Notice issued by the Council because it more accurately describes what development has taken place and is sought as part of the planning application.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider streetscene.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a two storey semi-detached dwelling located on the south west corner of the junction of Ripley Avenue and Lynwood Avenue. Its semi-pair is no.4 Lynwood Avenue. The area is residential with many semi-detached dwellings, and is within a built-up part of Egham. The site has a front driveway with a side and rear garden. There is a small garden space remaining to the front of the house which is grassed.
6. The development which is the subject of the appeal includes a brickwork parapet wall about 0.35m high with a wooden slatted fence on top reaching a height of about 1.5m, three brickwork piers about 1.8m tall, a wide sliding black/gold gate to a height just below the piers and a metal black/gold pedestrian gate.

7. Prior to the development being carried out part of the front boundary had a hedge on it about 2m high. The high hedge on the corner of the site has been left in place and it continues round to join the existing low wall and high fence which encloses the side of the rear garden of the appeal dwelling along Ripley Avenue.
8. Properties on Lynwood Avenue appear to be mainly semi-detached. There are some semi-detached bungalows on Ripley Avenue nearby. The front boundary treatments of Lynwood Avenue have a strong consistency. Whilst I noted, for example, that no.26 Lynwood Avenue had low metal gates, there tends to be front forecourt parking with front boundaries having low walls and hedges and no gates. The appearance of the Avenue is one of modesty, openness, greenery and lack of significant enclosure.
9. At the appeal site, the high brick piers, gates and fence appear out-of-keeping with the front boundary treatment prevalent in the Avenue. Whilst the gates and fence have some permeability, the effect is to enclose the semi-detached dwelling in a manner not typical of the Avenue. The materials used are also incongruous and the gates and fence draw the eye making them unduly prominent in the streetscene. I agree with the Council in their conclusion that the two-storey dwellings on the Avenue generally appear visually subservient to the townscape. The development which has taken place contrasts with that character to an unacceptable degree.
10. I have borne in mind that car theft is a real concern and that security is improved by the development which has taken place. This is a benefit for crime prevention which I have given weight to, however, it does not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
11. I conclude that the proposal unduly harms the character and appearance of the host dwelling and streetscene. It is contrary to policies EE1 (Townscape and Landscape Quality) of the Runnymede 2030 Local Plan (adopted 2020) and the Runnymede Design Supplementary Planning Document (2021).

Conclusion

12. Having considered all representations made, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas K.C.
Inspector