



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2020 by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/W/20/3249110

80 Norjen Precision Ltd, Holywell Road, Sheffield S4 8AS

- 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 Darren Nortcliffe against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/03471/FUL (Formerly PP-08113388), dated 22 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of 2.4m high triple palisade access gates (blue in colour) and palisade fencing to top of existing wall associated (fencing height between 2m and 2.6m).
-

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site relates to an industrial unit, located at the edge of a Fringe Industry and Business Area, opposite a residential area. The industrial unit is set back from the road, and follows the building line of the other several industrial units located to the north-east of the site. There is a low brick wall to the front of the appeal site, similar to that of the other industrial units located within this part of the road. The proposed development seeks to enclose the front boundary of the appeal site by introducing 2.4m high palisade access gates and palisade fencing above the existing brick wall.
 5. There are examples of this type of boundary treatment directly opposite the appeal site and further south on Holywell Road towards the junction with Upwell Street and to the north-east of the appeal site, towards the junction of Holywell Road with Jenkin Road. However, the public frontage of the appeal site as well as that of the other industrial units located within proximity of the site is open. The position of the industrial units set back from the road, and
-

- their low boundary treatments contribute to the openness of the immediate area. The openness is a positive feature of the street scene which facilitates the transition between the Industry and Business Area and the residential area.
6. Given the location of the fence and gates and their height and materials, the proposal would have a prominent position within the street scene. The introduction of a tall and stark boundary treatment would have an oppressive effect that would significantly reduce the quality of what is a generally open area. The blue colour of the fence and gates would not be sufficient to make their appearance acceptable within the street scene. Thus, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
 7. I do not find the proposal directly comparable with the green palisade fencing opposite the appeal site, as that fence is viewed against the vegetation behind it, which softens its appearance to some degree. Whilst this type of fencing is not uncommon within an industrial area, given the immediate context of the appeal site, the proposed boundary treatment would appear as an incongruous addition.
 8. I have taken into account the reasons for the appellant seeking to introduce the fence and gates and these appear, on their face, to not be without substance. In the main they revolve around security. I also acknowledge the benefits of the palisade fencing, which include increased security. However, I have no convincing evidence before me that the proposed boundary treatment is the only way through which the appellant's objectives can be achieved. I consider this particularly important in the context of the harm that I have identified.
 9. The Council has suggested that the enclosure of the forecourt would encourage the area to the front of the unit to be used for storage purposes, which in turn would add to the concerns about clutter in the street scene. The appellant stated that given the nature of the business and their products, there is no intention for the area to the front of the industrial unit to be used as ancillary open storage. I have no reason not to accept the appellant's intentions. However, this does not mitigate the harmful impact that the proposed boundary treatment would have on the character and appearance of the street scene.
 10. Accordingly, I conclude that through a combination of its siting, height and materials, the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, the development is contrary to Policies IB9 (c) and BE5 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan and Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy, which together state that, amongst other things, the massing, scale and materials of developments should be appropriate to the immediate context. These policies are consistent with the core planning principle of the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires new developments to add to the overall quality of the area.

Recommendation

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

Andreea Spataru

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Susan Ashworth

INSPECTOR