



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2020 by Ben Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/D0121/D/20/3261393

48 Puttingthorpe Drive, Weston-Super-Mare BS22 8LG

- 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 Thomas Hooper against the decision of North Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref 20/P/1034/FUH, dated 12 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Replaced hedge with fence and erected fence around my back garden'.
-

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 fence has been erected on site, as such the application is retrospective.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the fence on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for Recommendation

5. Puttingthorpe Drive is a pleasant, suburban street and part of a wider residential development in Weston Super Mare, made up mostly of consistent two storey, detached, semi-detached or terraced dwellings, set back from the road with off street parking. The front garden areas facing the road are largely open to the street with some landscaping which serves to visually soften the built form.
6. The tall close boarded fence encloses the entire side and rear garden of the host property, including immediately adjacent to the pavement. As such, it is prominent and highly visible from both directions along the street. It appears stark and conspicuous and is at odds with the boundary treatment fronting the highway of nearby properties in the street. It harms the open character of the street to its detriment.

7. It is acknowledged that there are other examples of close boarded fencing visible nearby, however these are side boundary treatments and not immediately adjacent to the main highway. The exception to this is the fencing around what appears to be the rear of the rugby clubhouse. This fencing, due to its scale and location next to the pavement on the main road, detracts from the open character of the street and is not a positive example to emulate.
8. I acknowledge that the fence prevents dogs from entering the garden area of the property and rubbish being disposed on the land, however it is likely that there may be other, less harmful solutions which would prevent this from occurring. These matters do not provide justification for the fencing.
9. In light of the foregoing, I conclude that the fence is harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The development conflicts with Policies CS12 of the North Somerset Council Core Strategy and Policies DM32 and DM38 of the North Somerset Council Development Management Policies Sites and Policies Plan Part 1 which collectively require development to be of a high standard of design and respect the characteristics of the site. The development is also contrary to the guidance set out in the Supplementary Planning Document 'Residential Design Guide – Section 2 Appearance and character of house extensions and alterations' (adopted 2014), which requires new boundary treatment be of an appropriate scale and material and to not harm the character of an area.

Conclusion

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

B Phillips

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR