
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2025

by Megan Thomas K.C. Barrister-at-Law

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/24/3351216

7 Vine Farm Road, Poole BH12 5EN

- 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 & Mrs Sam and Simone Taghizadeh against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch & Poole Council.
 - The application Ref. is APP/24/00499/F.
 - The development sought is changes to the boundary treatments.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The development sought in the appeal has already been carried out. This has not altered my approach to deciding the appeal. It has been determined on its own merits.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. 7 Vine Farm Road is a detached, two storey dwelling with a single storey side/rear extension linked to an outbuilding. It is located on the west side of Vine Farm Road. The land level of the site is slightly raised above the level of the Road. The site frontage is predominantly hardstanding in black, grey and cream paving, used for off road parking. The site forms part of a four property layout with open frontage to a shared access road.
5. The character of the immediate and surrounding area is primarily residential in nature, consisting of close-knit streets and cul de sacs of largely two storey detached housing with front and rear garden spaces and off-street driveways and parking areas. The character of the area is also influenced by the boundary treatments found throughout the immediate and wider context of Vine Farm Road. Some of the properties have low roadside boundary walls with close-boarded wooden infill panels on top that are set between taller brick piers. Some other properties have garden shrubs growing at the back of the footway and, in some instances, tall shrubs have been planted behind the walls/fences and overtop them. The planting considerably softens the appearance of the walls and fences and is a pleasing feature of the street scene.

6. The appeal site has low brick boundary walls erected to part of its south east boundary, with brick piers and infill fencing sections. These infill sections are close-boarded brown composite panels. The composite panels rise higher than the brick piers. Towards the entrance to the appeal site there is no low brick wall and there are five graduated composite fencing panels. There is a semi-circular border at the entrance with some planting in it but no low hedge as shown in the submitted drawings. To the north western boundary adjoining 9 Vine Farm Road and to the southern boundary with 5 Vine Farm Road there is close-boarded brown composite panel fencing. The height of the boundary treatment is generally about 2.150m.
7. I have borne in mind an expired planning permission which was apparently never implemented which allowed the low wall/brick piers with infill panels (as they existed in about 2009) to be extended northwards by about 2m. This was APP/Q1255/A/09/2106338. The overall height of the boundary treatment would have been, amongst other things, notably lower than what exists on the site today.
8. The combined height, materials and proximity to the highway result in a development which is dominant and highly unsympathetic to the streetscene. Whilst there may be higher boundary treatments and some low brick walls and piers on Vine Farm Road, they are generally made up of natural vegetation such as hedges and have used natural materials. None are as incongruous as the boundary treatment at no.7 in my view. Whilst there is off-street parking, the appearance of the road is reasonably verdant with some mature hedges, front garden planting and some grass verges by the footways. The long length of the roadside boundary treatment draws the eye and appears disproportionately high particularly where the fencing exceeds the height of the brick piers.
9. I have borne in mind the corner location of the dwelling, the comparative land levels and the appellants' desire for improved privacy and security, but these factors do not outweigh the harm to visual amenity resulting from the development.
10. I conclude that the development is unacceptably harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It breaches design policy PP27(a) and (f) of the Poole Local Plan (adopted November 2018).

Conclusion

11. Having considered all representations made, for the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

Megan Thomas K.C.

Inspector