



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 March 2021

By Andrew Bremford BSc (Hons) MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/A1720/D/20/3264035

1 Beverley Close, Park Gate, Southampton SO31 6QU

- 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 Nicola Gill against the decision of Fareham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/20/0826/FP, dated 7 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Featheredge fence to be put on top of existing brick wall to make this 6ft in total. Fence to start at the front corner of the house and to come out in line with the house to the existing brick wall. Fence to then run along the top of the brick wall to the drive way. Fence to then go back to the garage and a gate put in. Garage will be taken down if fence is able to be put up. Gate for the fence will be at the back left of the drive if looking at it from the road'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies within a residential area, where some dwellings have open frontages. Where properties have boundary treatments along the road frontage they are predominantly formed with low walls, hedges of varying heights, and other vegetation. Therefore, in terms of those properties which have boundary treatments along the road frontage in Beverley Close, the prevailing character is soft and verdant and where hard, is mainly low in height. In this regard, the appeal site with its low wall along the boundary with the road frontage, positively contributes to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The proposed fence would not enclose the front garden area of No 1 Beverley Close, which by virtue of it being an end of terrace property, occupies a prominent position within the street. However, it would, nonetheless, enclose the side garden area of No 1, which is located alongside Beverley Close. In doing so it would represent a tall solid feature on top of the existing low brick wall that forms the road frontage boundary of the host property.
5. Thus, as a result of its form, length, which would be around 7 metres, height and prominent position, the fence would appear as an incongruous feature substantially at odds with most other boundary treatments along the road

frontage in the vicinity of the site. Indeed, the appellant acknowledges that the proposed fence would not be in keeping with the rest of the road. Within the context of the existing boundary treatments along the road frontage and the generally open nature of property frontages in Beverley Close, the proposal would have a significant adverse visual impact upon the streetscene.

6. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy CS17 of the Fareham Borough Council Core Strategy 2011 which, amongst other things, sets out to ensure that all development responds positively to and be respectful of the key characteristics of the area. The proposed development would also conflict with the Fareham Borough Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (Excluding Welborne) adopted 2015, which requires, amongst other things, that the choice of boundary treatment and height should be determined by the positive elements within the street.

Other Matters

7. The appellant points out that the proposal would resemble the fence used to enclose an electricity substation in proximity to the appeal site. However, the substation is set back from the road frontage as is the fence that encloses it. Thus, it cannot be said that this existing fence, although in proximity to the appeal site, is directly comparable in terms of its position relative to the road frontage as that which would result from the proposed development.
8. I have taken into account the reasons why the appellant wants to enclose the side garden area. However, limited weight can be attached to such personal circumstances. Moreover, the lack of objections from neighbours is not a consideration that outweighs the harm caused by the proposed development to the character and appearance of the area.
9. None of the other matters raised alter or outweigh my conclusions on the main issue.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would be contrary to the development plan as a whole and there are no other material considerations which outweigh this finding.
11. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew Bremford

INSPECTOR