



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 December 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 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/20/3261443

147 Beesmoor Road, Frampton Cotterell, BS36 2JW

- 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 William Hendy against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref P20/11817/F, dated 6 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as retrospective planning permission for a 1.65 metre high screen fence to the frontage of an existing dwelling.
-

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 in this case is the effect of the fence on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons for Recommendation

4. The appeal property sits prominently on the corner of Beesmoor Road and Heather Avenue within the settlement of Frampton Cotterell. Heather Avenue is mostly characterised by semi-detached bungalows, whilst the longer Beesmoor Road is more mixed with some detached and some semi-detached properties evident. Both however have a mostly consistent set back from the road. The front garden areas facing the road are largely open to the street with limited side boundaries and low walls, and some landscaping or off-street parking which serves to visually soften the built form and give the immediate area a spacious open character.
5. The close boarded fence, rising above the height of the existing low wall, is prominent and highly visible from both directions along Heather Avenue and appears stark, enclosing and conspicuous, which is at odds with the otherwise low boundary treatment fronting the highway of nearby properties. It appears incongruous and harms the open character of its immediate setting, to its detriment.

6. The appellant points to other examples of boundary treatments nearby, such as at No 153 Beesmoor Road and opposite the appeal property surrounding the playing fields. The boundary treatment fronting the road at No 153 consists of a short wall with an open trellis fence above. This does not have the stark and prominent character of the fence erected at the appeal property. Similarly, the fence enclosing the open space opposite the appeal site is a shorter open design. Neither are directly comparable, therefore.
7. The appellant also points to a new detached garage to the front of No 126 Beesmoor Road and a conservatory and boundary hedge at a dwelling on the corner of Park Lane and Heather Avenue. It is unclear as to whether these developments were granted planning permission, however they are set back from the edge of the highway and are not comparable to the appeal fence. The hedgerow is also not comparable given its softening visual impact.
8. A number of further examples of boundary treatments are set out by the appellant; however, these appear to be either not fronting a highway, not comparable in terms of scale or material used or set a substantial distance from the appeal property. The impact on the surrounding area is generally concentrated on the street the appeal property is sited upon, not the entire settlement in general where character and appearance would be naturally varied and inconsistent.
9. I acknowledge that the fence prevents people or stray dogs from entering the garden area of the property and may have reduced incidents of things being thrown at the house. However, it has not been demonstrated that a more suitable and less visually intrusive boundary treatment would not achieve the same reduction in the fear of crime in addition to pollution or dust, as stated by the appellant.
10. It is noted that the appellant sets out that there has been a lack of communication and engagement with the Council with regards to alternative solutions. However, this is a matter to take up with the Council and not for this appeal.
11. In light of the foregoing, I conclude that the fence is harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The development conflicts with Policy CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy (2006-2027), and Policies PSP1 and PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan (Adopted Nov 2017), which require development to reach the highest possible standards of design and demonstrate the siting, form, height and materials are informed by, and respect and enhance the character of both the site and its context.

Conclusion

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

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. 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