
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 May 2017

by Roy Merrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 31 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/W/16/3161268

347 Gresty Lodge Barn, Crewe Road, Shavington, Crewe CW2 5AD

- 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 J Frizzell against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 16/1892N, dated 18 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a high wall to highway and associated gates (resubmission of application 15/5423N).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a high wall to highway and associated gates (resubmission of application 15/5423N) at 347 Gresty Lodge Barn, Crewe Road, Shavington, Crewe CW2 5AD in accordance with the terms of the application dated 18 April 2016 and the plans numbered M/66/1 and M/66/2.

Procedural Matter

2. The development has already been carried out.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is within an area characterised by dwellings that vary in age and design but which tend to be set back from Gresty Road. Properties are generally defined by low front boundary enclosures often augmented by mature perimeter planting. However, there is a prominent stretch of tall acoustic boundary fencing, associated with a modern housing development in close proximity to the site on the opposite side of the road.
 5. In terms of scale, the wall and gates subject to this appeal appear tall and imposing from the opposite side of the road. However, I concur with the appellant in that the development is proportionate to the extensive area of the plot. Although the height of the pillars is increased by the presence of decorative stone finials, these are few in number and do not appear as dominant features. Furthermore, the full extent of the development is only fleetingly visible on passing the site, being substantially obscured from
-

viewpoints further along the highway to the east and west. This is due to the presence of very tall boundary trees and hedges associated with adjacent properties, against which the form of the wall is also viewed and which help to visually soften the development.

6. Its curved design, regular spacing of pillars and use of contrasting red brickwork with blue banding give the structure an attractive sense of symmetry, whilst helping to break up its mass. Similar materials are evident within the main buildings on the site and also within the wider area, which the design has therefore had regard to.
7. Drawing together the above considerations, the wall, though large and not reminiscent of other nearby boundary enclosures, does not appear unduly dominant, is well integrated into its surroundings and does not disrupt any strong sense of uniformity or openness along the street scene.
8. I therefore conclude that the development does not result in harm to the character and appearance of the wider area. It would not therefore conflict with Saved Policy BE.2 of the Borough of Crewe and Nantwich Replacement Local Plan 2011 or the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as they seek to secure a high standard of design which respects the character and form of its surroundings.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons, and having considered all other points raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed and planning permission be granted.

Roy Merrett

INSPECTOR