
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2019 by Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu BSc MSc PIEMA RTPI (Assoc)

Decision by A U Ghafoor BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P2935/D/19/3230789

18 Scott Street, East Hartford, NE23 3AN

- 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 Melissa Simmons against the decision of Northumberland County Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00508/FUL, dated 11 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 18 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is to erect a maximum 2m fence as an extension to the current fence at the rear of the property, thereby extending the yard area.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. No. 18 is a two-storey mid terrace dwelling located on Scott Street. The surrounding area is predominantly residential. The distinctive character of the street scene is derived predominantly from suburban terraced blocks of dwellings. The curtilages to the rear are partly enclosed by fences or other means of enclosure. There are wide landscape gaps between rear gardens which add to the feeling of openness to the rear of Scott Street and an appearance of a neat and unified street scene. The proposed erection of a fence as an extension of the existing fence would enclose the entire backyard of no. 18. By virtue of its location as a mid-terrace property, the fence would be visually prominent when seen from the street, and the resultant development would form an incongruous addition to the street scene.
5. The appellant argues that no. 20 has erected a fence similar to the proposal. On the other hand, the Council assert that the fence and associated works at no. 20 were approved, because it did not have an adverse impact upon visual

amenity due to no. 20's end of terrace plot. I agree. In contrast, the appeal fence would have an adverse impact on the perceived openness to the rear of Scott Street and it would be out-of-keeping with the area's quality.

6. Furthermore, the appellant has presented examples of properties with fences enclosing their back gardens. Council decisions are a matter for it and these examples are not the appeal before me. Nevertheless, it is necessary to consider the merits of the appeal development. In that context, the enclosed yard would constitute an uncharacteristic addition to the street scene at the back of Scott Street. The existence of other development is not a strong enough reason to justify visually harmful development.
7. I find that the proposal would fail to enhance or improve the character and quality of the street scene. Consequently, it is at odds with the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy DC1 of Blyth Valley's District Local Development Framework Development Control Policies Development Plan Document (2007).

Conclusion and Recommendation

8. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

Appeals Planning Officer

Inspector's Decision

9. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I too agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

A U Ghafoor

INSPECTOR