
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2017

by Nick Palmer BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/D0515/D/16/3163738

Jondy, Church End, Leverington, Wisbech, Cambridgeshire PE13 5DB

- 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 & Mrs Cadenhead against the decision of Fenland District Council.
 - The application Ref F/YR16/0558/F, dated 16 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is a brick wall adjacent to the highway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a brick wall adjacent to the highway at Jondy, Church End, Leverington, Wisbech, Cambridgeshire PE13 5DB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref F/YR16/0558/F, dated 16 June 2016.

Procedural Matter

2. The wall has been erected and I shall consider the proposal on the basis that it is retrospective.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the wall on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The part of Church End where the site is situated has a variety of dwelling types including bungalows and two storey houses. These are informally sited in relation to the road which follows a curved alignment. The appeal property is a bungalow and the front boundary wall subject to this appeal is constructed of buff coloured bricks with piers and concrete copings. The piers are 1750 mm high and the wall panels are 1590 mm high. The wall includes an opening to provide vehicular access to the property and it adjoins the highway carriageway.
 5. I saw on my visit that there are a variety of front boundary treatments in the immediate area, including brick walls, fencing and hedges. The adjacent bungalow has a brick wall with piers of similar design to, but lower than, the wall subject to this appeal. The appellant states that that wall is 1400 mm in height with higher piers.
-

6. The wall may be higher than other front walls and fences in the immediate area but this difference is not excessive. The piers create relief and reduce its apparent scale and the bungalow remains visible above the wall. For these reasons I find that the height and scale of the wall are not excessive and that interest in the street scene is maintained. While the wall is prominent when approaching along Church End it is not unduly dominant or out of character given the varied pattern of development.
7. I conclude that the wall does not adversely affect the character and appearance of the area. For the above reasons the design is of an appropriate quality and moreover the brickwork appears to match that of the bungalow. The development accords with policy LP16 of the Fenland Local Plan (2014) which requires that development makes a positive contribution to local distinctiveness and character.
8. An interested party has raised concern over visibility for drivers emerging from the access road to the side of the site. However the Highway Authority has raised no specific objection and the Council's report confirms that the required visibility splay can be achieved within the public highway.
9. I saw on my visit that the wall appeared to have been completed in accordance with the submitted plan and there is thus no need to include a condition having this requirement.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Nick Palmer

INSPECTOR