



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2024

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31.01.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/RO660/W/23/3329614

17 Bentley Drive, Crewe CW1 5FR

- 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 Phillips against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref 23/1370N, dated 6 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 3 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as 'a retrospective planning application to retain the fence'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a fence at 17 Bentley Drive, Crewe CW1 5FR in accordance with the terms of the application, 23/1370N, dated 6 April 2023, and the plans submitted with it.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the fence on the character of the streetscene.

Reasons

3. No.17 Bentley Drive (No.17) is a two-storey detached house, located on the south side of Bentley Drive, a residential cul-de-sac. Bentley Drive is characterised by similar houses set back from the road with open plan frontages, driveways and front gardens.
4. Although No.17 fronts Bentley Drive, with its garden to the rear, its side boundary is formed by the cul

overly dominant. It does not detract from the open plan frontages, or the character of the streetscene.

6. Consequently, there would be no conflict with the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework (2023), Policy SE1 and SD2 of the Local Plan Strategy 2010-2030 (2017) and GEN1 of the Site Allocations and Development Policies Document (2022). Together, and amongst other things, these seek to ensure high quality design solutions that protect and enhance local character and distinctiveness.

Conditions

7. In addition to the standard time limit for implementation, the Council has suggested conditions that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and the external surfaces match the existing. As the fence has been constructed (and the application made retrospectively), these conditions are not necessary and accordingly have not been imposed.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR