



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2023

by H Wilkinson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N3020/D/23/3326637

257 Carlton Hill, Carlton, Nottinghamshire NG4 1GW

- 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 Brett Plant against the decision of Gedling Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2023/0434, dated 25 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 18 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is a retrospective application for the erection of a fence and gates.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a fence and gates at 257 Carlton Hill, Carlton, Nottinghamshire NG4 1GW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2023/0434, dated 25 May 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans;
 - Drawing No. 2234/P1 – Location plan, block plan and elevation

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development used in the banner heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in allowing the appeal I have altered the description to remove reference to the term retrospective as Section 55 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 does not differentiate between prospective and retrospective development. Nonetheless, as the fence and gates were in situ at the time of my site visit, I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a corner plot and is occupied by a detached property which has been sub-divided into apartments with associated garden land and on-site parking located to the front and side of the property respectively.
5. Properties within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site generally have either open frontages with no means of enclosure or are positioned behind a mix of low fences, walls, and hedging. However, in the wider area, the overall height and form of the existing boundary treatments together with the materials used in their construction varies as does the degree of openness. Indeed, I saw at my site

visit that there are examples of low walls and timber fences behind which lies soft landscaping and/or trees whilst several other properties along Carlton Hill are enclosed by a combination of stone walls with wooden fences or hedging above. Like the appeal site, these boundaries lie adjacent to footways and the highway meaning that they are no less prominent within the street scene. Collectively, this mix provides for a varied character and appearance.

6. Due to the siting of the fence to the rear of the stone wall, only the upper part of the timber panels and trellis is visible. Although two distinct elements, the overall appearance of the boundary is not dissimilar to the nearby means of enclosures which I observed on site. The height is also generally in keeping with the surrounding area. Further, whilst the entrance gates are not characteristic of the area, their positioning to the side of the property and their set back from the road junction means that they are not visually intrusive. In any event, the gates read as part of a continuous boundary, the height and appearance of which is consistent with the close boarded fence which lies on the opposite side of Carlton Mews. For these reasons and given the varied context, the appeal development is not an incongruous addition to the street scene.
7. Over the course of time, I am satisfied that the appearance of the development will soften as the timber weathers further supporting its assimilation. In addition, whilst not necessary to make the development acceptable, the supplementary trellis planting suggested by the appellant would further blend the fence into the context of its surroundings.
8. Accordingly, I find that the appeal development does not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It therefore accords with Policy 10 of the Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategy 2014 and Policy 43 of the Gedling Borough Local Planning Document Part 2 Local Plan 2018 where they seek to ensure that development is in keeping with the surrounding character in terms of its height, built form and general design. The proposal is also consistent with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

9. At the time of my site visit, in the early afternoon, I observed limited parking stress along Carlton Mews, although I recognise that at other times of the day demand for parking could be higher. Even if an additional vehicle needed to park on the road, given the scale of the existing accommodation and parking provision, I am satisfied that there is sufficient opportunity to park on the road without adversely impacting highway safety. Further, whilst noting the concerns expressed in relation to visibility, owing to the position of the fence, to the rear of the existing stone wall, the visibility splay at the nearby junction is unaffected.

Conditions

10. As the development has already taken place, the only condition necessary is to specify the approved plans in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given, the appeal is allowed.

H Wilkinson

INSPECTOR