

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2023

by John Whalley

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 July 2023

Appeal ref: APP/W4325/D/23/3322460

15 Beryl Road, Noctorum, Prenton, Wirral CH43 9RS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal of planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Thomas against the decision of Wirral Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application, ref. APPH/22/01917, dated 31 January 2023, was refused by a notice dated 21 March 2023.
 - Planning permission is sought for the retention of a 2m high fence to the front boundary.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. This appeal arises from the Council's refusal to grant planning permission for the retention of the 2m high fence that has been erected along the road frontage to the dwelling at No. 15 Beryl Road. The application was submitted retrospectively. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis, (s.73A of the Act).

Main issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is whether or not the appeal fence has materially harmed the appearance of this part of the Beryl Road frontage.

Considerations

4. The 2m high dark grey panel appeal fence has been erected along the back of the Beryl Road footway, to the full width of the front garden to the detached house at No. 15. The fence and its electrically powered gates were said to be 1.9m high with 0.1m spear headed spikes on top. The fence panels are supported by black posts at about 2.5m spacing.
5. I agree with the Council that the appeal fence is disagreeably obtrusive, to the point of being almost intimidating to those on the adjacent footway. The fencing appears more akin to a non-residential security fence than an agreeably sympathetic boundary suited to a dwelling in a pleasant residential road. It is insensitively out of character and appearance with its neighbours' pleasant low front boundaries on each side. I consider that the resulting

appearance of the front boundary to No. 15 to be significantly detrimental to the immediate street scene.

6. It may be the Appellants had individual security concerns that led to a particular need for this form of boundary to their home. It was also pointed out there are other houses along Beryl Road with high boundaries, utilising different forms of fencing, walling and hedging. I saw other front boundaries of similar height to that at No. 15 in Beryl Road. But most were built to designs better suited to this attractive residential road. Rather than suggesting an acceptable precedent, they show that a high level of security can be achieved without the visual harm objections at No. 15 that lead me to refuse planning permission for the appeal fence's retention.
7. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal should not be allowed.

John Whalley

INSPECTOR