
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 February 2021 by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/D/20/3261407

1A Brent Close, Poynton SK12 1HS

- 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 Abigail Palmer against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 20/1860M, dated 5 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a new fence at the property boundary to replace existing hedgerow and low 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.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a corner plot within a predominantly open-plan residential area, where the prevailing boundary treatment comprises of low walls and planting. There is a large area of mature planting along the side of the appeal site with Mallard Crescent, which makes a positive contribution to the open-plan street scene.
5. The proposed fence would project up to and along the full extent of the side boundary along Mallard Crescent, thus enveloping this landscaped space to within the appeal site. It would introduce built form of a substantial height and length immediately adjacent to the highway boundary, which would be highly prominent and fail to reflect the prevailing low boundary treatment in the area. As such, the proposal would read as a stark and incongruous addition to the street scene and would erode the established characteristics of the area.
6. I acknowledge that the appellant is willing to shorten the span of the fence, however no exact details are before me. Nevertheless, I am not convinced that a reduced span would overcome the adverse effects that the introduction of an uncharacteristically high fence would create. Additionally, landscaping is not

permanent thus the introduction of climbing plants along the fence would be insufficient in itself to justify harmful development.

7. I have not been provided with the specific details or the full circumstances in which the limited examples of fencing along the highway boundary in the area have been approved. I observed that where boundaries are taller, these tend to comprise of mature vegetation which gives the street scene a softer visual appearance and greater degree of permeability than the proposed fence would. As such, the examples do not serve to justify this appeal proposal.
8. Consequently, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and would therefore conflict with Policies SD2 and SE1 of the Cheshire East Local Plan, Local Plan Strategy 2010-2030 (July 2017) which seek development to contribute positively to, and protect an area's character and distinctiveness.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

H Ellison

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. 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