

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2016

by Jonathon Parsons MSc BSc(Hons) DipTP Cert(Urb) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20th January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/B1740/W/16/3147839

1 Ridley Close, Holbury, Hampshire SO45 2NR

- 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 Chris Churcher against the decision of New Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/10071, dated 15 January 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 April 2016.
 - The development proposed was originally described as "Erecting a fence over 1 metre at front of property. Fence is around 1200mm and has a trellis on the top. The fence is wooden with wooden posts".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The application description additionally details the background to the submission of the planning application. Such details do not relate to the actual development and thus have not been included with the development description in the banner heading above. The fence has been erected and I have considered it on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dwelling within a cul-de-sac which has garden and hard surfaced areas to the front. The fence is close-boarded and wooden with a trellis above. It is sited alongside a highway turning area and partly alongside a shared vehicle parking area down the side of the property.
 5. The immediate area is mainly characterised by open frontages and landscaped areas, including hedges. There is some fencing and walling within the cul-de-sac, including a fence within a hedge to the west of the appeal property and some low level walls on some property frontages but this does not detract from the significant open and landscaped character and appearance of the area.
-

6. The fence is at a prominent position adjacent to the turning area and has a substantive presence by reason of its extent and height. Consequently, it is conspicuous and has a harsh urban appearance within the predominant open and landscaped context of the site. For these reasons, the development is harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, it conflicts with Policy CS2 of the Core Strategy for the New Forest District Council outside the National Park 2009, which amongst other matters, requires new development to be well-designed, contribute positively to local distinctiveness and sense of place, and be sympathetic to its surroundings in terms of scale, height, appearance, materials and relationship to adjoining buildings and landscape features.
7. It has been indicated that the fencing prevents damage to parked cars from children playing football but even if this was problematic, it has not been demonstrated that other solutions have been explored to resolve this. The effect of the fencing on visually breaking up the views of the 1970s style dwelling would be minimal because of the height and width of the dwelling. For these reasons, individually and cumulatively these considerations do not outweigh the identified harm to the character and appearance of the area. In the event planning permission is refused, it is indicated that the fence could still remain albeit at a reduced height. Nevertheless, my duty is to consider the fence as erected for consideration and for the reasons indicated, it has been found unacceptable.

Conclusion

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

Jonathon Parsons

INSPECTOR