



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 June 2020

by A Caines BSc Hons MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/D/19/3243658

23 Cambridge Crescent, Crofton, Wakefield WF4 1RZ

- 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 Ms Charlotte Bewley against the decision of City of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02325/FUL, dated 15 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of boundary fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a corner property facing Cambridge Crescent and Rutland Drive. It is located within a small residential estate of properties that are mostly open to the road, apart from some low level enclosures and hedges.
4. The fence is comprised of two sections, one on each road frontage. These are approximately 1.8 metres high and of a close boarded timber design. The drawings indicate trellis above is not part of the proposals and I have considered the appeal on that basis.
5. Whilst a hedge could be maintained at a similar height, the fencing is a hard feature, which by virtue of its appearance, height and prominence, is dominant in the respective street scenes and does not integrate comfortably with the surroundings. Colour treatment is not sufficient to overcome this harm. I do not know the circumstances which led to the fence on the opposite corner of Cambridge Crescent. However, it appears to be lower, and together with its design and backing vegetation, has a less imposing and disruptive presence in the street scene, so is not justification for the appeal scheme.
6. The fencing would have privacy and security benefits and I appreciate the difficulties posed in this respect by the corner location. However such private benefits would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area, and it is likely that less harmful options would achieve similar objectives.

7. I conclude that the development is unacceptably harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such, it is contrary to Policies D9 and D10 of Wakefield's Local Development Framework Development Policies (2009). Together, these require development to respect, and where appropriate enhance the character of the locality. It is also contrary to the Wakefield District Residential Design Guide Part 2: Guidance for Householders Supplementary Planning Document (2018), which advises that boundary treatments are often a dominant feature of the street scene and closed boarded timber fencing panels of 6ft (approximately 1.8 metres) or more in height are unlikely to be acceptable at the front of properties. The conflict with the development plan means the proposal is not sustainable development.

Other Matters

8. I have noted the comments from other interested parties regarding the effects on highway safety and the condition of the adjoining pavement. These matters did not feature in the Council's reasons for refusal and as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons it is not necessary to consider these matters any further as they would not alter the outcome of the appeal.

Conclusion

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

A Caines

INSPECTOR