



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 January 2025

by **G Ellis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/24/3345873

Twoony Mead, Nursery Road, Loughton IG10 4EF

- 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 & Mrs Alex & Emily Petrou against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref is EPF/0535/24.
 - The development proposed is for a front boundary wall and gates.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Twoony Mead is part of a linear row of properties along the eastern side of Nursery Road, with open countryside to the other side of the road, which is part of Epping Forest. At the time of my site visit the appeal property was surrounded by scaffolding and shrouding with work taking place. There was also temporary hoarding to the front boundary.
4. The style of properties along Nursery Road varies, and many have been altered and extended, creating large, detached houses. Set back from the road there is variation to the form of the front boundaries. There are properties with open frontages with low-level walls, but equally, along this stretch of Nursery Road, there are a number of properties which have more defined boundaries. From my observations, there is an increased height and enclosure to some of the frontages, particularly to those properties which have been redeveloped. That being said, generally, a level of openness and greenery is maintained with railings on top of walls of a modest height with hedging behind, providing a sense of space and contributing to the verdant character of the area, which forms a transition between the residential area and the Forest.
5. The proposal would effectively create a continuous boundary at a height of approximately 1.8m. The panels above the wall would be set slightly lower than the pillars and the materials and design would reflect the modern property being created. Nonetheless, the horizontal panels and scale of the boundary would,

despite the gaps, have a visually solid appearance and result in a barrier along the front of the property. As such, the height and enclosing form of the boundary treatment would be to the detriment of the prevailing character.

6. I acknowledge, as referenced by the appellant, that there are other examples of solid boundaries in the surrounding area. Little Brow and Beechwood House, along Nursery Road, in particular, have notably enclosed frontages. The planning background for these is not before me, but I do not find that these few interspersed additions have a positive impact on the street scene. While Nursery Road is undergoing a transition in terms of the scale and style of the properties, the extent of front boundaries of the height and form proposed is not prevalent and each proposal is to be considered on its own merits.
7. In conclusion, I find that the height and design of the proposal would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area. Thus, it would fail to accord with Policy DM9 of the Epping Forest Local Plan 2023, which requires a high-quality design, and for developments to relate to the local character of the area and make a positive contribution to a place.

Other Matters

8. The appellant has raised concerns with regard to the handling of the various planning applications relating to the property and indicates that the boundary treatments formed part of the previous scheme. While I understand the appellant's frustrations, the Council's approach to these previous applications is a separate matter. I have considered this proposal for boundary treatment on its own merits, and there are no other considerations which indicate that the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

G Ellis

INSPECTOR