



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2020

by S Tudhope LLB (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/D/19/3237670

4 Henry Preston Road, Tasburgh, Norwich NR15 1NU

- 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 James Keenan against the decision of South Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/1539, dated 17 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is to erect 5 foot fencing panels supported by concrete gravel boards and posts along the boundary.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. Henry Preston Road is a residential road that leads to a number of other similar small cul-de-sacs. A primary school is located at the end of the road. Most of the properties have modest frontages with parking and small garden areas that are set to grass with ornamental plants and trees, with some low-level hedging and fencing. This gives the street a pleasant soft landscaped and open character.
4. The appeal property is located on a prominent corner plot whereby the side boundary and rear garden of the dwelling leads into the adjoining road. The existing garden wall is stepped away from the boundary leaving a sizeable grass verge between it and the pavement. This area contributes to the open character of the street. The proposed fence would by virtue of its prominence, height and length be obtrusive in the street scene. It would appear at odds with the established character and thereby would fail to respect and respond positively to its context.
5. I note there are other examples of similar fencing in the area, but such features are not widespread. Moreover, at the entrance to Henry Preston Road these features have a harmful imposing effect and fail therefore to provide justification for the appeal development.

6. I conclude that the development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. Thus, it conflicts with Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk 2014 and Policies DM3.4 and DM3.8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document 2015 and the National Planning Policy Framework. Together these policies seek to ensure development proposals are of high-quality design and avoid harm to the character and appearance of an area.

Other matters

7. I understand the concerns in relation to dog fouling, however, this does not mean that the appeal scheme is an acceptable resolution. I also appreciate the desire to better utilise the whole of the site by enclosing it and the privacy the fence would provide, but these matters do not outweigh the harm to the street scene. I am not persuaded that potential alternatives to the appeal scheme would not also provide such benefits and so these factors fail to overcome or override the identified harm to the character and appearance of the area.
8. In addition, whilst no concern has been raised in respect of impact on living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties or highway safety and no objections from neighbours were received, acceptability in these respects is a neutral factor rather than a benefit of the scheme.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

S Tudhope
Inspector