



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 May 2024 by A Khan BSc (Hons) MA MSc

Decision by Chris Forrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D5120/D/24/3338317

47 The Quadrant, Bexley, Bexleyheath DA7 5LH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Gary Curtis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Bexley.
 - The application Ref is 23/02460/FUL.
 - The development proposed is 0.9 metre composite fence with a 0.3 metre composite trellis on top either side of drive on my boundary.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for 0.9 metre composite fence with a 0.3 metre composite trellis on top either side of drive on my boundary at 47 The Quadrant, Bexley, Bexleyheath DA7 5LH in accordance with the terms of the application reference 23/02460/FUL.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. As noted in the application documents, and from my site visit, the proposal has already been carried out. Given this, and that this is reflected in the application, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the development as carried out as the trellis design differs from that shown on the submitted plans.
4. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been revised since the determination of the application by the Council. However, as the policies in the Framework that are material to this decision have not fundamentally changed, I am satisfied that this has not prejudiced any party and I have therefore made my recommendation in accordance with the revised Framework.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are the effect of the appeal scheme on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, and on highway safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

6. The appeal site is located in a residential area comprising of semi-detached bungalows. Property frontages are dominated by hard surfaced parking areas with low boundary treatments which mainly consist of low front brick boundary walls. Notwithstanding that, there are a few properties which have timber front boundary treatments. The generally low front boundary treatments contribute to the openness of the area, yet there is some variance in colour, height and design.
7. The appeal scheme comprises of two fences, one to each side of the property frontage. The fences are around 1.22 metres in height in total with the solid element of the fences being around 0.9 metres in height with a patterned trellis above which allow views through them.
8. As observed at my site visit, there are other boundary treatments which are higher than the appeal proposal which both front the pavement as well as the side boundaries to their respective properties. This is particularly the case for the corner properties in the centre of The Quadrant. These fences are prominent in the streetscene but are nevertheless part of its character.
9. Whilst the height of the appeal proposal is greater than those of its immediate neighbours, its height would not be so excessive to the extent that the development would be harmful to the overall character of the area. This is particularly the case given the high fences in the centre of The Quadrant and that the trellis element of the proposal allows for views through it which maintains an element of openness to the property frontage.
10. Turning to the materials used in the development, the colours used integrate well with the materials of the host property and hardstanding to the frontage. In addition, I noted a variety of different colour variants used on boundary treatments along The Quadrant. Whilst the use of composite panels in the solid element of the fence is not typical, it nevertheless is not harmful. Taking all of the above into account, in my view, the scheme is in keeping with the character and appearance of the host property and would not give rise to any harm to the overall character of the area given the variety of existing boundary treatments.
11. Consequently, the appeal scheme would complement the surrounding area and would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It would also accord with Policies SP5 and DP11 of the Bexley Local Plan (2023) (LP) which, amongst other matters, requires that design should respect the existing character and context and that the height and materials of proposals compliment the surrounding area and contribute positively to the street scene.

Highway safety

12. The Quadrant is a quiet cul-de-sac which forms a square with dwellings both in the centre of it and around its perimeter. There is also a pedestrian link through to Long Lane. Given the nature of the road, there are minimal vehicular and pedestrian movements.
13. The appeal development adjoins the pavement and, as noted above, is around 1.22 metres in height in total. There is also a lamp column and a telegraph pole within the pavement close to each side fence.

14. Given the overall height of the appeal proposal, and that it is possible to see through the trellis element of the fence, users of the pavement would be able to see vehicles exiting the appeal site. Similarly, drivers exiting the driveway would have sufficient visibility through the trellis to the extent that they would be able to see pedestrians and other users of the pavement. This is particularly the case given the likely position of vehicles using the driveway and the relative positions of the lamp column and telegraph pole.
15. Taking these factors into account, and that the appeal site is on a very quiet road with low pedestrian traffic, the proposal would not have a significant impact on highway or pedestrian safety.
16. Taking the above into account, I find that the proposal would not unacceptably impact on highway or pedestrian safety and would accord with Policy DP24 of the LP, which requires that development should not have a significant negative effect on the safety of any users, including pedestrians and cyclists.

Conditions

17. Given that the development has already been carried out, it is not necessary to impose the standard time limit condition for the commencement of the development. Similarly, it is not necessary to specify the approved plans. Furthermore, there are no other conditions which I consider to be necessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

18. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

A Khan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

19. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR