



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 April 2022

by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2430/D/22/3291758

11 Granville Road, Melton Mowbray LE13 0SN

- 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 Micura against the decision of Melton Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00374/FULHH, dated 25 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2021.
 - The development is erection of fence and veranda.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of fence and veranda at 11 Granville Road, Melton Mowbray, LE13 0SN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00374/FULHH, dated 25 March 2021, and the plan nos. 1795 Location Plan, 1795 New Boundary Treatment Detail & Block Plan, and Veranda Elevations.

Preliminary Matters

2. The fence and veranda were in place at the time of my site visit and therefore I have considered the appeal on a retrospective basis.

Main Issue

3. The Council raise no objection to the veranda. The main issue therefore is the effect of the fence on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The area is wholly residential and is set around a network of streets with Granville Road and Abingdon Road forming the north/south roads, and Dulverton Road, Alvaston Road and Beaconsfield Road being the east/west roads between them. The properties in the area generally have low boundary treatments in front of the houses, creating an open character. However, there are some taller fences and hedges at corner plots where the side boundaries of some properties face the roads. This dilutes the openness of the area at these corners.
5. The appeal site sits on the corner of Granville Road and Alvaston Road. The property on the opposite corner of Granville Road and Alvaston Road has a close-boarded fence around 1.8 metres in height along its boundary with Alvaston Road and a taller hedge facing Granville Road. The neighbouring house to the south, No. 9, sits on the corner of Granville Road and Beaconsfield Road. That property has close-boarded fencing, similar in colour and height to that at the appeal site, along its boundary with Granville Road.

6. In the wider area, there are fences of a similar height to that at the appeal site at the junctions of Beaconsfield Road and Abingdon Road, Alveston Road and Abingdon Road, and Dulverton Road and Abingdon Road. Although in those cases the fences may not extend for the same length as that at the appeal site, they nonetheless form solid, tall features in the respective street scenes.
7. In this context, especially when seen with the fence at the property opposite, the development is not incongruous. In addition, the dark wood fencing materials used reflect the fence at No. 9, and the accompanying brick piers and dwarf wall generally match the bricks used on the dwelling at the appeal site.
8. As such the development does not harm the character and appearance of the area. It hence accords with policy D1 of the Melton Borough Local Plan (2018) which aims to ensure development is high quality and sympathetic to the character of the area.

Other Matters

9. The veranda is modest in scale, does not project forward of the neighbouring house and is barely visible in the street scenes. This also therefore accords with policy D1.

Conditions

10. As the development has already been completed, there is no need to impose the standard condition relating to the commencement of development. Also, the materials are acceptable so it would be unnecessary to control these by a condition. The Council have suggested a condition be imposed identifying the relevant plans, but instead I have included those plans within the terms of the decision in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

11. The development accords with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no other material considerations to suggest the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR