The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 May 2024

by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date:17.05.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V3120/D/24/3339741
Hill House, Reade Avenue, Abingdon, Oxfordshire, OX14 3YE

- 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 Jenny Wood against the decision of Vale of White Horse District Council.
- The application Ref P23/V2665/HH, dated 27 November 2023, was refused by notice dated 12 February 2024.
- The development proposed is to replace an existing boundary fence.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. Since it is more succinct and accurate the description of the proposed development is taken from the Council's decision letter rather than from the original application form.

Main issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property, a detached dwelling, stands at the junction of Reade Avenue and Denton Close within a maturing residential estate. The existing fence is erected at the back of the footway fronting Denton Close, a quiet cul-de-sac. The timber fence is about 1.8m high topped by a trellis about 0.5m high. Judging from its appearance and condition, the fence has seen far better days, and I can therefore understand the appellant's wish to replace it.

5. The proposed replacement fence would be comprised of a solid timber fence 2.3m high supported by concrete posts with a concrete base. The appellant says that the solidity is needed at a higher level to ensure privacy and security in her rear garden, given that its level is above that of the footway outside.

6. To my mind, such a high fence would have a stark and utilitarian appearance harming local visual amenities at the entrance to the cul-de-sac. However, I saw that fencing was not uncharacteristic of the area, and I therefore consider that a replacement on a like for like basis would not prove unreasonable. The trellis would at least provide the opportunity for plants to be trained to act as a

screen in the interests of privacy. Greenery at trellis level would also reduce the harsh impact of a solid fence on its surroundings. However, it is not open to me to modify the scheme by the imposition of a condition.

7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Accordingly, a clear conflict arises with those provisions of policy CP37 of the Vale of White Horse Local Plan directed to achieving good quality design appropriate to the site and its context.

8. All other matters raised in the representations have been taken into consideration, including the absence of local representations, but no other matter raised is of such strength or significance as to outweigh the factors that led me to my conclusions.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR