



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 April 2023

by N Teasdale BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V0728/D/23/3315968

6 Rosedale Crescent, Guisborough TS14 8HZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Antwhistle against the decision of Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council.
 - The application Ref R/2022/0821/FF, dated 20 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 14 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is fence to boundary.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The decision notice cites Policy SPD4 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan, 2018 (LP). However, the policy as provided by the Council relates to SD 4 and the authority has since confirmed that this discrepancy was a typing error. I have determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey detached dwelling located in a prominent position on the corner of Rosedale Crescent within a residential setting. The property is set back from the road with a garden area to the front and a strip of landscaping along the side. This landscaping covers a reasonable space along Rosedale Crescent, running parallel and adjacent to the pavement. There are a number of trees, shrubs and bushes located on the land and this contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. Due to the site's location on a corner plot, the proposed fence would be highly visible from the road, including views on approaching the site along Rosedale Crescent. I observed the properties nearby and noted that their front gardens are generally open with planting and hedging. The absence of any built form creates a pleasing sense of openness within the street scene.
6. Whilst the proposed fencing would be set back from the road to the front, the new fencing to the side boundary would remove the strip of landscaped space and this, together with the positioning of the fence closer to the pavement, its

overall design, height, and excessive length, would be visually prominent and incongruous within this open setting.

7. I appreciate that there is an existing fence enclosing the side and rear garden areas. However, that fence is located further back from the road, and it is screened to a certain extent by landscaping. Consequently, its presence is less obvious. Whilst there would be some open areas retained to the front, the proposed fencing would appear visually prominent and discordant in the street scene whilst also detracting from the openness of the built form.
8. My attention has been drawn to a property in the nearby street of Ryedale, which benefits from a similar fence which I observed whilst on site. I do not know the history of that development. Nevertheless, lengthy fences directly adjacent to the road are very few and far between and, in any event, do not justify development which would be harmful to the overall character and appearance of the area. I am also considering the scheme that is before me, and I have identified the harm that would arise.
9. For the above reasons, the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Part j of Policy SD 4 of the LP which amongst other matters, requires development to respect or enhance the character of the site and its surroundings in terms of its proportion, form, massing, density, height, size, scale, materials and detailed design features.

Other matters

10. I am aware of the appellants' frustrations regarding communication with the Council. However, I attribute limited weight to this matter, and it has not affected my findings on the main issue.
11. I have taken account of the appellants' desire to make the garden safer and give protection from the road. I have also had regard to the comments relating to ownership and the lack of objection from statutory consultees, including the Highway's Department and the Town Council. However, these considerations do not outweigh the harm or alter my findings on the main issue.

Conclusion

12. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the identified harm and associated development plan conflict. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Teasdale

INSPECTOR