
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2017

by Gwyn Clark BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 2nd November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/17/3179496

3 Bingley Road, Shipley BD18 4RH

- 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 Mrs Caroline Penn against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00480/HOU, dated 24 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2017.
 - The development is to install a fence along the front and rear perimeter of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The fence has been erected and I am therefore considering the appeal retrospectively.
3. Since the appeal was submitted the Council has adopted a new development plan and I have considered the appeal in the context of this plan rather than the superseded Replacement Unitary Development Plan for the Bradford District 2005 having allowed the parties a suitable opportunity for comment.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The mainly terraced houses facing the main road in the vicinity of the appeal site are set back from the road behind shallow front gardens and a boundary marked by either a low wall or more typically with a wall with hedging. This provides a very attractive landscaped setting for the traditionally designed houses and gives the street scene a pleasant, open appearance. This is despite the dominance of the main road on this approach to the Saltaire World Heritage Site.
6. No 3 Bingley Road is a large Victorian semi-detached house sitting in a prominent location at a major traffic-light controlled junction. In contrast to this general character described above, and in contrast to the low wall and hedgerow boundary surrounding the front and side garden of the neighbour, a close boarded timber fence has been erected behind a low boundary wall. This

has a very harsh and visually jarring appearance in the street scene. It appears out of place and due to its particularly prominent position causes significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.

7. The development therefore conflicts with policy DS1, DS3 and SC9 of the Local Plan for the Bradford District Core Strategy 2017 (LPCS) which collectively requires new development to create a strong sense of place and be appropriate to their context. It would also conflict with Policy EN3 of the LPCS which requires development within the Buffer Zone of the Saltaire World Heritage Site to preserve, protect and enhance its character and appearance. It runs contrary to the advice contained within the Householder Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (HSPD) which says that boundary treatments should normally match the height and type of properties on either side and that this is particularly important if the uniform appearance of the street is a distinctive characteristic of the area. The use of hedging to the front boundary rather than fencing is a distinctive characteristic of the area.
8. Policy DS5 of the LPCS seeks high quality, inclusive design solutions that reduce opportunities for crime. A reasonable degree of privacy and security has been achieved elsewhere through using a more natural and characteristic boundary treatment. The HSPD advises that frontage boundary treatments should not normally obstruct views of a house from the street as this will prevent natural surveillance and provide opportunities for criminals. Consequently a need to provide privacy and security to the front of the property does not outweigh the significant harm caused by the fence to the character and appearance of the area, the fence is not of a high quality design and for this reason the development conflicts with policy DS5 of the LPCS.
9. I have considered other examples provided of front boundary fences erected in the local area but have determined this appeal on its own merits. I do not consider that staining the fence in a different colour and/or encouraging climbing plants to swathe the fence would lessen its incongruous appearance. The various matters raised by the appellant concerning Council procedure are not matters for me or relevant to my determination.
10. For the reasons given above and having taken all other relevant matters into account, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gwyn Clark

INSPECTOR