



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2020 by Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu BSc MSc MIEMA
CEnv AssocRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V4250/D/20/3257862

3 Garton Drive, Lowton WA3 2LH

- 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 David Oxley against the decision of Wigan Council.
 - The application Ref A/20/88996/HH, dated 17 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is new front boundary wall.
-

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. It was observed on site visit that construction of the wall has already begun.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. No. 3 is a two-storey detached dwelling located at the beginning of Garton Drive in Lowton area of Warrington. The surrounding area is residential. The distinctive character of the street scene is derived predominantly from two-storey detached dwellings with open front garden space. This creates a feeling of openness and an appearance of a neat and unified street scene.
6. The proposed erection of a front boundary wall with pillars and railings would enclose the entire front of no. 3 except for the driveway. By virtue of its location, overall height, design of brickwork and black wrought iron railing which would be in contrast with the rendered finish of the host property as observed on site visit, the boundary wall would be prominent when viewed from the street and would be visually incongruous with the street scene.

7. The appellant contends that there are varying types of boundary treatments along Garton Drive and has presented some examples of which they argue are up to 2.3 metres in height. However, as observed on my site visit, these examples are boundary treatments to the rear and sides of properties, mostly enclosing rear gardens. Open front gardens are still a predominant feature of the street and they contribute significantly to the spacious character of the area.
8. I also observed on site visit that No. 12 Garton Drive as well as 54 Beardsmore which is at the junction with Garton Drive have their front gardens enclosed with low lying brick walls which match the host property. These examples do not provide a proportionate comparison with the proposal which would appear more prominent and at odds with its surroundings based on its height and design, as stated in paragraph 6.
9. Nevertheless, it is necessary to consider the merits of the appeal development. In that context, the new front boundary wall which would enclose the front garden would constitute an uncharacteristic addition to the street scene. The existence of other development is not a strong enough reason to justify visually harmful development.
10. Taking all the above points together, I find that the height and design, of the proposed new front boundary wall would harm the character and appearance of the street scene. The other considerations advanced do not outweigh the harm which would be caused by the proposal. Accordingly, there would be conflict with the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and policies CP10 and CP17 of the Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2013).
11. These policies amongst other things seek to ensure that new development respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the borough and its locality, in terms of materials, siting, size, scale and details used.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and on that basis, I agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR