
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2017

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 06 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E1210/D/17/3175118

51 Stour Way, Christchurch BH23 2PQ

- 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 Ian Evans against the decision of Christchurch Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 8/16/2484/HOU, dated 30 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is for a boundary fence above 1m adjacent to highway at 51 Stour Way.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated at the junction of Stour Way and Squirrels Close which comprises a residential area with predominantly open front gardens. At the time of my site visit some of the fence had been erected across the front boundary with Stour Way. The proposal in totality would involve the replacement of the picket fence which previously existed, and in part still exists, with higher horizontally boarded hit and miss fencing.
4. The proposal would be an extensive, quite imposing form of boundary treatment that would be contrary to the prevailing pattern of development in the locality. Consequently, I find the replacement fencing as an incongruous feature which detracts from the open, verdant nature of the area where no or low level boundary treatments in this section of Stour Way tend to predominate. Therefore, I find that due to the height, extent and siting of the fence, that it would not form a sympathetic element in the street scene as it is not in keeping with the character of the area. I have noted the other examples cited by the appellant, however, each case must be assessed on its own merits.
5. I acknowledge the reasons as to why the appellant installed the fencing, namely that the remaining part of the picket fence is rotten, and low, therefore it is not the most secure means of containing their dogs within the front of their property. This and their concerns with regard to a loss of privacy from

individuals walking past their house are noted, in addition to me being given no substantive reason to find that there would be any issues in respect of junction visibility, therefore, I am satisfied that highway safety would be maintained. Furthermore, I accept that the proposal would not have any material impact upon the living conditions of the occupants of surrounding neighbouring properties, however these matters do not outweigh the harm that the proposal would have upon the broad openness of the front garden scene within the road.

6. I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the area. The proposal is contrary to Policy HE2 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Core Strategy, (Part 1) which requires the design of new development to be of a high quality, reflecting and enhancing areas of recognised local distinctiveness which stipulates that to achieve this development will only be permitted if it is compatible with or improves its surroundings in terms of, amongst other things, layout, site coverage, architectural style, scale, height, materials, landscaping and visual impact.

Conclusion

7. Therefore, having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR