

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2016

by D Cramond BSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 06 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/D/16/3161140

34 Downview Close, Yapton, West Sussex BN18 0LD

- 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 Mr G Graham against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref Y/20/16/HH, was refused by notice dated 6 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is to replace 2.7m high hedge with a wooden panel fence 1.8m high.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The development has been completed; this does not alter my approach to determining the merits of the proposal

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is a corner plot with a detached home and relatively generous garden. It lies within an area of established residential character with broadly similar primarily semi-detached and terraced homes which, along with the spaces around and landscape, come together to create a visually pleasing neighbourhood. The proposal is as described above and embodies a fence run of some 16 metres along a secondary road.
 5. For the most part privacy to back gardens, where they abut public highway, footways or footpaths on this estate is provided by hedgerows or walls matching homes and with or without landscaping in front. This, combined with front garden planting and some 'open plan' characteristics, gives a sense of unity and visual quality to the locality. Where fences are visible they are low key, set back and/or dividing properties with lower heights to front gardens, taller screening to rear. Regrettably this fence is an alien feature and does detract unduly from streetscene. It immediately abuts the footway with no room for planting to soften the utilitarian structure with its untreated timber
-

appearance and concrete posts and base plates. It does not complement or mimic the quality of the brick walls seen from time to time nearby and, in this instance, featuring alongside. The solution used to attain privacy and security at the appeal property is overly utilitarian and unfortunately this is a prominent location. In summary the scheme would lack sympathy and harmony with the street scene and the character of the area.

6. Policy GEN7 of the Arun District Local Plan 2003 and Policies D DM1 and D SPI of the Arun Local Plan 2011-2031 (Publication Version), taken together and amongst other matters, seek to ensure that development is of high quality design, would respect or enhance local distinctiveness, would embody suitable materials, and would generally accord with an area's local character. I conclude that there would be conflict with these policies.

Other matters

7. I do sympathise with the call for enclosure of this garden area particularly given the security problems in the past, incursion by animals and the age of the occupant. I appreciate that the insurance company has restricted its pay-out and that the need for planning permission came as a surprise and such events can be stressful. The fence may be able to be removed in years to come as a hedge may well grow up on the inside. However in terms of the streetscene at least in the mid term such planting in that position, in contrast to beneficial landscape in front, would be of little or no visual value. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
8. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered; the Council's policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within that document.

Overall conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the locality. Accordingly the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR