



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2020

by A Parkin BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/20/3255658

126 Sandford Grove Road, Sheffield, South Yorkshire S7 1RT

- 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 Mohammed Zaheer Khan against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01098/FUL, dated 13 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 5 June 2020.
 - The appeal development is a new boundary fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal development has been erected. An application for planning permission for the development was subsequently submitted, refused by the Council, and is now the subject of this appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal concerns a semi-detached property which occupies the southern corner plot at the junction of Sandford Grove Road and Thorne Road.
5. This is a predominantly residential area, characterised by traditional, garden-fronted dwellings of various types and designs and with a range of different front boundary treatments. The topography of the area is hilly. Sandford Grove Road slopes quite steeply downwards as it passes the appeal property from southwest to northeast, whilst Thorne Road also slopes downwards towards its junction with Sandford Grove Road.
6. The appeal development comprises solid timber panel fencing with a curved lattice top and supported by timber posts. There is a solid timber gate next to the driveway at the southernmost part of the property.
7. The fence and gate are positioned to largely enclose the raised front garden area of the appeal dwelling, above a stone wall which marks the boundary of the appeal property and the public footpath. The wall is said to have a nominal

- 1.2 metres height¹. The appeal fence largely follows the curved shape of the wall and is some 1.8 metres high², according to the submitted drawings.
8. The actual height of the fence above the ground varies slightly with the sloping topography of the streets and the curved design of the top. However, from the evidence, it extends to some 2.5 – 3.0 metres above the footpath level. In contrast, the built front boundary treatments of the next door properties on Sandford Grove Road and Thorne Road are considerably lower in height.
 9. The built front boundary treatments of the dwellings on the opposite side of Sandford Grove Road and Thorne Road are also significantly lower in height than the appeal fence. The boundary hedge at 2 Thorne Road extends to a similar height above the footpath as the appeal fence. However, it has a softer, natural appearance that complements other planting in the garden and is not out of keeping with the area.
 10. The design, scale, height and position of the appeal fence makes it a highly prominent and incongruous feature in the streetscene, readily visible from the adjacent streets, and due to its elevated corner location, especially in views from the northeast along Sandford Grove Road.
 11. The appellant refers to other 'similar height fences' in the area but does not specify any examples³. I noted a wide range of boundary treatments in the area, including walls, hedges and fences of various designs and heights.
 12. Some of the fences were similar in appearance to the appeal fence. However, there is no evidence before me to show that these other fences have planning permission and none occupy such a prominent position in the streetscene as the appeal fence.
 13. In any event, each proposal should be determined on its individual merits, with appropriate regard to the development plan and material considerations, which is what I have done in this case.
 14. I note that the appellant originally intended to paint the appeal fence green. This would not alleviate the considerable harm that I have identified, as set out above.
 15. For these reasons the appeal development adversely affects the character and appearance of the area. It therefore conflicts with Paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (the Framework) in this regard.
 16. The Council refers to conflicts with Policies BE5 (Building design and siting) and H14 (Conditions on development in housing areas) of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan 1998, and to Guidelines 1 and 2 of Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance, on its Decision Notice refusing planning permission. However, I can find no specific conflicts in this case.

Other Matters

17. I note a comment from a third party regarding 127 Sandford Grove Road. This is a matter beyond the scope of this appeal.

¹ The actual height of the wall varies with the gradient of the streets, with a 'stepped' design.

² To the top of the curved lattice.

³ I note the addresses listed at Section K of the Appeal Form and viewed these properties from the street. They were not obviously comparable to the appeal property

18. At Section K of the Appeal Form, the appellant has drawn my attention to two other undetermined appeals in the area that they have submitted. Other than their addresses, no details of either appeal, such as the reference numbers, the matters of dispute, whether the appeal development has taken place, or any drawn information has been provided. Consequently, I have not had regard to these appeals in determining the appeal before me.
19. I note the appellant's reasons for wanting the appeal fence, including to prevent overlooking and vandalism, and to protect their household. However, these factors do not overcome the significant harm to the character and appearance of the area that I have identified above, and do not cause me to reach a different conclusion with regard to this appeal.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Parkin

INSPECTOR