
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 October 2017

by Alison Partington BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 7th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C3240/D/17/3179232

145 Woodside Road, Ketley, Telford, Shropshire TF1 5WT

- 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 Mark Akeroyd against the decision of Telford and Wrekin Council.
 - The application Ref TWC/2017/0239, dated 1 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I note the detailed description of the development given on the application form. The more concise description used in the banner heading above, is taken from the decision notice. The fence has already been erected on the site, and I have determined the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Woodside Road forms part of a relatively modern estate of detached, semi-detached and short rows of terraced houses. The estate has an open and spacious character which in part results from the fact that the front boundaries of dwellings are generally open or in some cases marked by low vegetation. In addition boundary treatments on corner plots are generally limited in height, and set back from the pavement by areas of vegetation which reduces their prominence.
5. The appeal property is situated on the corner of Woodside Road and Snowdrop Meadow, and occupies an elevated position in relation to the road. The fence has been erected immediately behind the existing boundary treatment of the property along Snowdrop Meadow which abuts the pavement.
6. From my observations, the fence sits very uneasily within the street scene. It fails to respect the prevailing character of the area due to its height, (an aspect which is exacerbated by it having been erected at garden level which for most of its length is above the level of the road), its scale and prominence.

Consequently, it is overly dominant in its setting, and appears as an incongruous and discordant feature that does not integrate appropriately with its surroundings.

7. As a result I consider the development unacceptably harms the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly it conflicts with Policy CS15 of the *Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted December 2007)* and Policy UD2 of the *Wrekin Local Plan (adopted February 2000)* which seek to ensure that development respects and responds positively to the local context including boundary treatments, so that it strengthens local identity, and has a positive influence on the appearance of the area.
8. In support of the appeal my attention was drawn to some other prominent boundary treatments on properties in the wider area which it is suggested do not blend in with the local area. I do not know the circumstances of these cases, or the policies that applied at the time of their consideration, but noted that they were located on an older housing estate. In any event, those I saw confirmed that inappropriate boundary treatments are detrimental to the character and appearance of the area, and so do not set a precedent that should be followed. In addition, I note that the fence does not have any impact on neighbours, but this is not sufficient to outweigh the harm I have described.
9. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Alison Partington

INSPECTOR