



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2019

by Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/C3240/W/19/3233011

10 East Road, Ketley Bank, Telford TF2 0DD

- 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 Dawn Kennedy against the decision of Telford and Wrekin Council.
 - The application Ref TWC/2019/0387, dated 22 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of a fence at side of the property starting 3.2m in from the edge of the road and 1.8m high.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the banner above comes from the application form, although I have omitted the reference to retrospective planning permission and added "erection of" to include an act of development.
3. At my site visit I saw that a fence has been erected on the appeal site although this is higher than that shown on the appeal drawings. The existing fence has been the subject of a previous planning appeal which was dismissed. The submissions indicate that the revised scheme subject of this appeal seeks to address the reasons for that decision. Whilst I have noted the fence on the appeal site, my assessment is based on the submitted plans.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site lies on a corner plot with the house front facing East Road and the side boundary running along Hillside Road. The area is predominantly residential with varying house designs, land levels and road widths creating a pleasant environment with mixed character.
6. The proposed fence would run along the Hillside Road boundary of the site. Whilst the appeal drawings show the fence measuring 1.8 metres high, it would be positioned on top of an embankment so would appear taller when seen from the road. If retained, trees on the embankment would partially screen the fence, but a lack of existing vegetation means it would be clearly visible from

Hillside Road near to the road junction and when travelling along East Road from the direction of Greyhound Hill.

7. By reason of the prominent location, elevated position, size and lack of screening, the fence near to the East Road/Hillside Road junction would be obtrusive in the street scene. Furthermore, Hillside Road is narrow and set below the appeal site, so the fence would appear as an overbearing feature to those travelling up the hill to the junction. Consequently, the fence would be unduly conspicuous and thereby would fail to respect and respond positively to its context. Suggested measures to overcome concerns relating to the industrial appearance of the fence would not address or override the harm that would be caused by reason of its prominence and dominating impact.
8. Close boarded fencing is apparent in the area, although this is generally in less prominent locations compared to the appeal development. I note the nearby fences on top of tall retaining walls, but such features are not widespread. Moreover, these features have a harmful imposing effect and so fail to provide justification to allow the appeal development.
9. The appellant contends the proposed fence would be lower and more attractive than a fence that previously existed on the appeal site. However, this no longer exists and the evidence fails to convincingly demonstrate its height, length and positioning. As such, I afford this negligible weight in the determination of the appeal.
10. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, and in this regard, it would be contrary to policies BE1 and BE2 of the adopted Telford and Wrekin Local Plan 2018 and the National Planning Policy Framework which aim, amongst other things, to ensure development proposals are of high-quality design and avoid harm to the character and appearance of an area.

Other Matters

11. No concerns have been raised by the Council in respect of highway safety or living conditions of occupiers of nearby residences. However, acceptability in these respects is a neutral factor rather than a benefit of the scheme to which I would afford positive weight.
12. The fence would provide privacy and security to the appeal property and I give positive regard to these factors in my assessment. However, I am not persuaded there are no alternatives to the appeal scheme that would also provide such benefits and so these factors fail to overcome or override the identified harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathan Edwards

INSPECTOR