

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 October 2016

by **Christa Masters MA (hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 07 October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/J1535/D/16/3153953

72 High Beech Road, Loughton, Essex IG10 4BL

- 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 Mrs Debbie Stubbs against the decision of Epping Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref PL/EPF/0257/16, dated 29 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of brick boundary wall on Forest View Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of brick boundary wall on Forest View Road at 72 High Beech Road, Loughton, Essex IG10 4BL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/EPF/0257/16, dated 29 January 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) No development shall commence until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the wall hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved samples.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: FKK_460, FKK_001.

Procedural Matters

2. I have used the description of development as provided in the decision notice as this represents the most accurate description of the appeal proposal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a dwelling located on a prominent corner plot between High Beech Road and Forest View Road. It is within an established residential area. There is a wide variety in the front garden boundary treatments including hedges, brick walls and fencing of varying heights and styles. All of these contribute to the established character and appearance of the area.
-

5. The Council have explained how the brick wall would replace a previous fence which was a similar height to the appeal proposal. The appeal proposal would create a 1.8m high wall along the frontage to Forest View Road. This boundary is unique to this corner plot location as, unlike other visible boundary treatment along the road, it in effect represents the boundary to the rear and side garden of the host dwelling. As acknowledged by the Council in the officers report, boundary treatments of this height are not unusual in situations like this where the rear garden of a corner plot adjoins the highway. I agree with this statement and the proposal must be seen within this context.
6. The appellant has detailed how the wall would be constructed with piers positioned at intervals, a header course and flemish bond brick. All of these details would add interest and to my mind ensure that the wall would complement the existing pallet of materials in the area and complement the existing variety of boundary treatments. Furthermore, the wall would step down to a lower level along the boundary to take account of the gradual slope in the road.
7. As a result of the appearance of the wall, detailing and materials proposed, I conclude the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area, or the street scene generally. It would therefore accord with policy CP2 (iv) of the Local Plan (LP) 2006. Policy CP2 (iv) advises, amongst other things, that proposals should safeguard and enhance the setting, character and townscape of the urban environment. Policy DBE1 has also been referred to however this is a three part policy which relates to new buildings. As this proposal is for a wall, I am not convinced it is directly relevant to the issue before me.

Conditions

8. A standard condition limiting the life of the permission is necessary. I also agree that it is necessary to specify the approved plans as this provides certainty. In the interests of character and appearance, I have also included a condition to require samples of the materials proposed to be used on the wall hereby permitted to be submitted and approved by the local planning authority.
9. I note that the Loughton Residents Association Plans Group have suggested a number of other conditions concerning landscaping, a restriction on demolition work and a requirement for wheel washing facilities. However, given the modest scale of the proposal, and the fact that the proposal relates to a private residential dwelling, I do not consider such additional conditions would be either reasonable or necessary.

Conclusion

10. I therefore conclude that having considered all matters raised, the appeal should be allowed.

Christa Masters

INSPECTOR