



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2021 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N3020/D/21/3272883

2 Stewarton Close, Arnold, NG5 8DJ

- 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 Martin Bardell against the decision of Gedling Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/1162, dated 14 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is the re-alignment of a garden wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and unconditional planning permission is granted for the re-alignment of a garden wall at 2 Stewarton Close, Arnold, NG5 8DJ in accordance with the terms of application ref: 2020/1162, dated 14 November 2020.

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.

Preliminary Matter

3. The wall that is the subject of this appeal has already been constructed. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site comprises a detached two-storey dwelling located on a corner plot at the junction of Stewarton Close and Howbeck Road. While the area is largely characterised by open front gardens, due to the layout of the estate there are a number of dwellings with rear gardens than are adjacent to the highway and these gardens are enclosed with high brick walls. A large proportion of these walls contain timber panels between the brickwork, although timber fencing alone and walls that are solely constructed of brick are also present in the vicinity of the appeal site. Overall the area has an open, green and attractive appearance and character and the occasional presence of
-

higher enclosures surrounding those rear gardens does not significantly undermine that character.

6. The garden wall at the appeal property abuts the pavement to the side of the property, which is not uncommon for boundary walls in the area, and is topped with decorative detailing using darker bricks and cement. The wall is of a similar height to the other walls in the street with the height of the wall changing slightly to follow the slope of the street. The wall does not have timber panels similar to other walls in the immediate area, however if timber panels are not properly maintained then they can look untidy and detract from the appearance of the street. Whilst I appreciate that timber insets can break up the apparent mass of a wall and provide visual interest, in this case, the wall covers a short stretch of the garden and the wall does not present a lengthy expanse of brickwork. For these reasons, the wall as built complements the character and appearance of the area and blends in with the existing boundary treatments in the street scene.
7. I understand that an area of soft landscaping and vegetation was removed when the wall was erected. However, this vegetation could have been cut down or removed at any time. Furthermore, the removal of this area of landscaping and the erection of the wall has not significantly affected the green and open character of the street, with gardens remaining to the front and rear of the structure.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal does not cause harm to the appearance and character of the street scene. The proposal subsequently accords with Policy 10 of the aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan (September 2014) which requires development to make a positive contribution to the sense of place, with particular regard for massing, scale and materials. The proposal also complies with the design aims of section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

9. The appeal proposal is retrospective and the wall has already been constructed in accordance with the submitted plans and details. Consequently, a condition requiring compliance with the submitted plans, or any other condition, would be unnecessary.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted unconditionally.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, agree with the recommendation and shall allow the appeal and grant planning permission unconditionally.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR