



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 January 2020

by A Thompson BSc BTP MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C3810/D/19/3242111

31 Cheviot Close, East Preston, BN16 1EX

- 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 and Mrs Collins against the decision of Arun District Council.
 - The application Ref EP/82/19/HH, dated 1 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local street scene.

Reasons

3. The majority of properties surrounding the appeal site have open front gardens with some hedges and low level landscaping and relatively few fences or walls. Although the open plan front garden would be retained, the provision of a close boarded fence, mostly 1.8 metres in height, along the front, side and rear boundary of the appeal property, as indicated on the submitted plans, would introduce a substantial and unsympathetic form of boundary treatment in a locally prominent location.
4. Given the scale, prominence and discordant form of the development proposed, I find that the fence would have an adverse impact on the local street scene and, therefore, harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would consequently be contrary to Policy D DM1 of the Arun Local Plan and Policy 5 of the East Preston Neighbourhood Plan, which amongst other things, seek to ensure development reflects or preserves the local street scene.
5. In reaching this finding, I have had regard to the existing side and rear boundary timber fencing of similar design on a number of properties nearby that have been drawn to my attention by the appellant. I do not consider that these examples have the same degree of prominence as the appeal site, nor do they demonstrate, in my view, that such fences reflect or preserve the local street scene, rather they are at odds with the generally open character of the area. Consequently, I attach very limited weight to this consideration.

6. Similarly, I give only very limited weight to the suggestion that the proposed development is necessary to provide for the safety, security and privacy for occupiers of the property. There is no clear evidence to suggest the current boundary treatment is significantly deficient in relation to these considerations and I noted on my site visit that although parts of the hedge appeared dead or dying, other parts appeared to be healthy and growing.
7. These factors do not outweigh the harm I have identified. Finally, I do not consider that the existing hedge has a harmful impact on the street scene by virtue of its scale and condition, on the contrary, it complements an existing and substantial landscaping feature on the other side of Cotswold Way.

Conclusion

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

Anthony Thompson

INSPECTOR