



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 March 2021

by Rachael Pipkin BA (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/20/3260355

2 Parker Road, Bournemouth BH9 1AY

- 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 John Allgrove against the decision of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref 7-2020-9075-A, dated 23 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'As 2 Parker Road, Bournemouth BH9 1AY is on a corner plot, the garden goes around the front and side of the house. Following the Corona virus lockdown, it flagged up a need for an enclosed family garden. My requirement is to erect a 6 feet high wooden fence behind the front wall of the property, which will still allow parking at the side of the property (accessed via Waterloo Road), but provide an enclosed garden around the front and side of the house. This is similar to the fence surrounding the corner house of Truscott Avenue, Maxwell Road and Heron Court Road. Enclosing the garden in this way, will help to provide a safe and secure enclosed space for any small children that may live at the property, enable some privacy for the occupants, provide an enclosed garden space, thereby promoting health and well being for the occupants and in addition, provide a barrier between the garden area and pedestrians walking past who may cough and expel droplets into the air.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. On 1 April 2019, Bournemouth Borough Council ceased to exist and became part of a new Unitary Authority known as Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole Council. The development plans for the merged Local Planning Authorities will remain in place for the area within the new Unitary Authority they relate to until such time as they are revoked or replaced. I shall therefore determine the appeal having regard to the policies of the Bournemouth Local Plan: Core Strategy (2012) (Core Strategy).

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Number 2 Parker Road (No 2) is an end of terrace house positioned at the corner of Parker Road and Waterloo Road. Residential properties in the

surrounding area are characterised by either open frontages providing access to driveways or low front boundary walls, one or two of which have tall hedges behind. No 2 has a characteristic low rendered wall which, due to its corner position, encloses and separates areas of front and side garden from the footpath. This enables views of the host property as well as visibility between the two roads. This contributes to the openness of the streetscene.

5. The proposed development would enclose a large part of the front and side gardens with a wooden fence which would increase the boundary wall to just under 2 metres high. The installation of a high fence would appear as an incongruous and prominent feature within the streetscene, out of character with the more open frontages of residential properties along both Parker Road and Waterloo Road. The height of the fence at the back edge of the pavement would be a highly intrusive feature in the street scene. It would restrict views of the host property from the street, resulting in a fortress effect. It would also significantly reduce visibility between the two roads, eroding the openness at this street corner. This would be harmful to the character of the area.
6. The presence of a supermarket car park on the opposite side of the road does not reduce the harmful effect of the proposal which would be widely visible from the surrounding area.
7. My attention has been drawn to a number of other wall and fence combinations to corner properties within the area. However, it seems to me that these structures cause a similar level of harm to that which I have identified. For this reason, I do not consider these justify the proposal before me.
8. The Council has indicated that these fences have been installed without the benefit of planning permission. Whilst I appreciate the appellant's frustrations in this regard, this is a matter beyond the scope of this appeal. It falls to me to judge this appeal on its own individual merits which I have done.
9. I conclude the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy CS41 of the Core Strategy which required well designed development that respects the site and its surroundings and contributes positively to the appearance of the public realm. It would also not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework which requires development to be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character. It would also not comply with the Council's guidance on Residential extensions: A design guide for householders 2008 which sets out that inappropriate fencing can degrade the character of an area.

Other Matter

10. I understand that the appellant is seeking to make his garden more secure and private and to provide safe outdoor play space. However, it seems to me that there may be alternative ways of achieving this that are less harmful to the character of the area. I therefore give this limited weight.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Rachael Pipkin

INSPECTOR