



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2019

by Rachael Pipkin BA (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/X1545/D/19/3225705

Farcroft, Burnham Road, Latchingdon CM3 6HA

- 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 G Carr against the decision of Maldon District Council.
 - The application Ref HOUSE/MAL/19/00065, dated 18 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is retention of close boarded fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for close boarded fence at Farcroft, Burnham Road, Latchingdon CM3 6HA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HOUSE/MAL/19/00065, dated 18 January 2019, and plan numbered 18-053-PP-04 ISS:02.

Procedural Matter

2. The fence that is the subject of this appeal has already been erected. This appeal therefore seeks retrospective permission for the development.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The close boarded fencing has been erected along the front boundary of Farcroft, a detached house on Burnham Road, a busy rural road. It is a high timber fence supported by concrete posts and occupies a long stretch of frontage, set back behind a grass verge.
5. The surrounding area is semi-rural, characterised by open fields interspersed with properties fronting Burnham Road. There is no prevailing form of boundary treatment within the local area as there are nearby examples of properties with close boarded fencing including Thatch Cottage and Norden, as well as some with lattice and weave fencing, brick walls and front boundary hedges. Some, like Thatch Cottage, have additional planting in combination with the fence but there are also examples locally where close boarded fencing has been used with no additional planting.
6. Greenacres, opposite the appeal site, has a lattice fence fronting the highway with close boarded fencing to each of its side boundaries and a large area of

hardstanding. This fencing is more prominent and clearly visible from the streetscene than the fence subject to this appeal due to the open character of the site. In the context of this development opposite, the fence, while a more urban form of development, does not detract from the overall semi-rural character of the wider area.

7. Furthermore, while the fence is high and occupies a long stretch of frontage, this section of Burnham Road is relatively straight with fast moving traffic which, in combination with mature vegetation along the side boundaries of the appeal site, restricts views of the fence on the approach to the appeal site in both directions. I observed on my site visit a limited amount of shrub planting to the grass verge in front of the hedge which has also helped to break up the visual impact of the fence.
8. In the context of surrounding development, the close board fencing to Farcroft does not appear out of keeping with the character of the area. This, in combination with the limited views of the fence, leads me to conclude that the fence would not be overly prominent within the streetscene and it would not unduly harm the character and appearance of the area.
9. I note that the appellant has offered to provide planting to the front of the fence to reduce its impact. While additional planting would be a benefit, as I have found no significant harm it is unnecessary for me to impose a condition requiring this. Furthermore, this area to the front of the fence appears to be public highway and it is not clear that such planting could be implemented anyway.
10. I conclude that the proposed development does not harm the character and appearance of the area. It therefore complies with Policies S1, S8 and D1 of the Maldon District Local Development Plan 2017 which together support quality design that respects and protects local character. It also accords with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed and planning permission should be granted.

Rachael Pipkin

Inspector