

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17th July 2017

by Alison Roland BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 02 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/17/3175235

253 Bingley Road, Shipley, West Yorkshire, BD18 4DW.

- 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 W Suzuki against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref: 17/00451/HOU, dated 3 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 12 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is fence of 1.8 metres high x 4.6 metres wide x 10 centimetres depth to help block noise and keep out debris.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the implications of the proposal for the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The fence is already insitu and comprises a close boarded wooden construction of around 1.8 metres in height sited behind a low stone wall to the property frontage. The majority of properties in this terraced block and others in the vicinity feature low stone walls to the property frontages with or without supplemental hedgerow planting. In this context, the wooden fence imparts an unduly strident hard edge to the front garden and the timber construction appears out of character with its surroundings. Whilst there is a further timber fence in this particular terrace at No 257, it is lower in height and softened by an adjacent hedgerow which is presently growing across the top of it. The Council also say it is likely to be unauthorised.
 4. The appeal fence looks particularly out of place as it stands somewhat awkwardly behind the existing stone wall and rises well above the stone pillars at either end, appearing as an afterthought. I do not consider painting or staining it a darker colour would overcome these concerns. Moreover, it is sited in a prominent roadside position on a main approach road to the Saltaire World Heritage Site, where the mellow stonework of the surrounding terraced blocks
-

and their mainly traditional front boundary treatments forms part of its wider setting.

5. The appellant refers to other nearby timber fences at Nos 3, 4, 82 (the Council cite No 83), 227 and 231 Bingley Road. However, the Council have confirmed that none of these have the benefit of planning permission and Nos 3 and 4 have recently been refused. It is thus incorrect to say that they condone these particular fences and that they form some form of benchmark against which to assess the appeal proposal. Indeed, they serve to demonstrate how jarring inappropriate boundary treatments can appear in the context of nearby Victorian and/or Edwardian properties.
6. I recognise the fence performs some function restricting noise entry into the property and also acts as a barrier to the deposition of litter into the front garden; the latter being a problem in the past due to the proximity of the adjacent bus stop. However, the benefit the fence affords in these regards must be balanced with the wider public interest in terms of its impact on the street scene.
7. For these reasons, I conclude on the main issue that the fence is an unsympathetic addition to the front garden of the property which detracts from the character and appearance of the area. This brings it into conflict with Policies D1 and UR3 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan for the Bradford District (2005), together with the advice in the Householder Supplementary Planning Document (2012), which seek to ensure that development proposals make a positive contribution to the environment and quality of life, through high quality design which is well related to the existing character of the locality and does not have an adverse effect on the surrounding environment.

ALISON ROLAND

INSPECTOR