



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 August 2020 by Alex O'Doherty LLB(Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by Elizabeth Jones BSc (Hons) MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D0121/D/20/3253847

33 Claverham Road, Yatton BS49 4LA

- 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 Miss Marie Head against the decision of North Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref 19/P/2984/FUH, dated 30 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is a panelled fence surrounding the perimeter of the garden and a gate with extension of two brick columns.
-

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.

Procedural Matter

3. The proposed development is already in place and I shall deal with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a bungalow situated on a prominent corner plot, at the junction of Claverham Road and Claverham Close, in a residential area. There exists a mix of boundary treatments in the surrounding area, including low stone and brick walls with sporadic soft landscaping and open access driveways, which create an attractive and relatively spacious street scene.
6. The development introduces a fence which wraps around the front boundary of the property along its entire length facing Claverham Road, and partially extending along its front boundary with Claverham Close. Given its location the development is clearly evident in views in both directions along this stretch of the road. Due to its solid form and height, the fence significantly obscures a large proportion of the host property. Additionally, due to its scale, it appears as an overly-dominant structure, considering the modest form of the host

property. These factors have combined to harm the host property's appearance.

7. Additionally, the development appears out-of-scale with the other boundary treatments in the immediate vicinity. Thus, it appears as an incongruous feature in the locality, which largely consists of low walls and open aspect front drives. Although some soft landscaping is visible above the fence, its imposing and harsh appearance results in a dominant feature, which does not integrate well with its surroundings and the wider visual context. I observed that the painted brick pillars appear out-of-character with both the traditional form of the low brick wall beneath, and the other walls along this stretch of Claverham Road. Overall, I consider that the fence is harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of other fences in the area, some of which I looked at during my site visit¹. These fences relate to other locations and differing contexts and thus, are not directly comparable with the appeal site. Furthermore, I do not know the precise planning circumstances behind them. I have therefore considered the appeal before me on its individual merits having regard to its specific context in the street scene.
9. In their appeal submissions, the appellant has indicated that further works have been carried out to the fence and pillars to improve their appearance, including painting the brick pillars and trimming the fence posts. However, these measures do not overcome the identified harm. Furthermore, whilst the appellant is willing to implement even further alterations, I have not been provided with any such details and thus cannot be satisfied that further alterations would make the development acceptable.
10. I therefore conclude that the development has an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Thus, it conflicts with Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2017) and Policies DM32 and DM38 of the Development Management Policies: Sites and Policies Plan Part 1 (2016) which collectively require that the design and planning of development proposals should demonstrate sensitivity to the local character, and the setting, and enhance the area taking into consideration the existing context. The development also conflicts with the advice given in the Residential Design Guide – section 2: Appearance and character of house extensions and alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2014) that boundary treatments should not harm the character of the area.

Other Matters

11. Having regard to the aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty contained in the Equality Act 2010, I understand the appellant's desire for a reduction in traffic noise and improved safety for their family but I consider that any benefit in these respects does not outweigh the identified harm that is caused by the dominant fence. Moreover, I am mindful that the harm identified is permanent and is therefore not outweighed by the appellant's particular circumstances.
12. Overall, I find that the matters advanced in support of the proposal, do not, either individually or collectively, outweigh the harm identified, nor the conflict with the development plan.

¹ I observed those fences referenced by the appellant as Nos 5, 6, 7 and 8.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alex O'Doherty

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Elizabeth Jones

INSPECTOR