The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 January 2022

by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N3020/D/21/3282470
131 Coronation Walk, Gedling NG4 4AR

- 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 Daniel Horsepool against the decision of Gedling Borough Council.
- The application Ref 2020/1081, dated 28 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2021.
- The development proposed is the erection of a fence adjacent to highway.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. At the time of my site visit the development had been carried out. I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. This appeal concerns the existing front boundary fence of a semi-detached property within a residential area where front boundaries tend to comprise of low walls, fences and hedges. Although there are examples of high hedges in the locality, namely the boundary of the property opposite the appeal site, they are limited in number and, moreover, create a soft and permeable appearance to the street scene.

5. To the contrary, the existing fence introduces solid built form of a considerable height and length in a prominent corner location. It is readily apparent and appears as a stark and incongruous feature that erodes the sense of openness in the street scene and is at odds with the predominantly low boundary treatments in the area.

6. Whilst it is appreciated that the appellant seeks to have a private and secure side garden area, I am unconvinced that this cannot be achieved by a boundary treatment that is more in keeping with the locality.

7. The appellant has suggested a number of alterations which they could make to the development. I am not convinced that painting the fence in a different colour or attaching fake foliage would overcome the concerns with the design, height and coverage of the fence. Additionally, the details regarding how the

fence could be lowered in height are limited and, moreover, it is important that I consider the development on the basis of what was before the Council when it made its decision.

8. Accordingly, the development harms the character and appearance of the area and thus conflicts with the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy 10 of the Greater Nottingham, Broxtowe Borough, Gedling Borough, Nottingham City, Aligned Core Strategies, Part 1 Local Plan (September 2014) which seeks to ensure that developments reinforce and make a positive contribution to the public realm.

Other Matter

9. Concern regarding how the Council processed the planning application is not a matter for me within the context of this appeal, which focusses on the acceptability of the scheme in practice.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

H Ellison
INSPECTOR