
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 September 2023

by Elaine Benson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/23/3324127

5 Gateacre Rise, Liverpool L25 5LA

- 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 Andrew Hennessey against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref 23H/0695, dated 15 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 26 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as 'to retain new boundary fence to side and rear with ivy trellis'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The appeal property is a detached dwelling house standing at the junction of Gateacre Rise and Chartmount Way. A 2.1 m high fence has been erected to the side and rear of the property, abutting the highway. Planning permission is sought for its retention and for the installation of an artificial ivy trellis on the fence. The appeal fence replaces a small boundary wall and hedge.
3. Some properties in the locality have combinations of low walls, fences and hedges. However, the primary characteristic of the estate remains its relative openness due to their generally low heights.
4. The appeal fence stands in a prominent corner location at the road junction, with a long expanse of fencing along Chartmount Way. It is obtrusive and out of character with its surroundings, harming visual amenity. The proposed artificial ivy trellis would introduce an unnatural, man-made feature which would further harm visual amenity and the street scene. Its artificiality cannot reasonably be compared to a natural hedge. Furthermore, over time, the trellis is likely to deteriorate, having a poor appearance and exposing the fence behind.
5. The appellant considered the original fencing, hedging and boundary trees to be unsightly and unmanageable. He felt that their replacement was a necessary upgrade to the property which would also improve security. Nonetheless, as demonstrated above, more appropriate boundary treatments are available which would better respect the character of the surroundings.
6. There are a few taller front and side fences nearby, including one opposite the appeal site. However, the Council indicates that there is no record of any

consent for this structure or for the other roadside fences in the locality that were identified by the appellant. But in any event, their presence demonstrates the harm that such structures can cause to the character and appearance of an area. Higher boundary treatments are not in keeping with the local character.

7. In conclusion, the height, length and prominent location of the boundary fence has an overbearing visual impact and appears incongruous and obtrusive within the street scene. The installation of artificial ivy trellis work would be a visually obtrusive and discordant feature adding further detriment to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. For these reasons the proposed development is contrary to Policy UD1 of the Liverpool Local Plan.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR