



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 April 2025

by **Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D0515/D/25/3358778

192 Stonald Road, Whittlesey, Peterborough, PE7 1QR

- 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 Andrew Holyoak against the decision of Fenland District Council.
 - The application Ref is F/YR24/0831/F.
 - The development proposed is described as *'The works are to remove dead conifers, and replace an existing wall an (sic) aluminium fence. The fence would make the viewing to road more feasible for pulling out of driveway and not have the driveway one viewing.'*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations to existing brick boundary wall involving addition of aluminium slatted fence to a max height 1.8m at 192 Stonald Road, Whittlesey, Peterborough, PE7 1QR in accordance with the application Ref F/YR24/0831/F, subject to the following conditions:-
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL01; Schedule of works.
 - 2) The brick materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Preliminary matter

2. The Council's decision notice describes the proposal as 'Alterations to existing brick boundary wall involving addition of aluminium slatted fence to a max height 1.8m'. As this describes the proposal more accurately, I have considered it on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a detached, modern two storey dwelling sited on a busy residential road of properties of various ages, sizes and styles, most of which are set back from the road with generous front gardens, resulting in a spacious, suburban character. Stonald Road is a very long straight road with a wide carriageway and footways. There is a variety of heights and materials in front boundary treatments. Most properties have low front boundaries but there are

some examples of higher boundaries. Whilst many are formed by brick walls, there are a few that are formed of fencing or railings and several examples of hedged boundaries. Often the boundaries reflect the age and style of the dwelling and this variety provides some interest in the street scene.

5. No 192 sits at the eastern end of a group of modern dwellings that have detached garages to the front of their plots. Most of those have double width driveway openings and front boundary walls of some 1m in height. To the west are two older dwellings that have single width driveway openings and open plan front gardens with only low planting or no front boundary. The appeal dwelling has a wide double driveway opening with sections of boundary wall on each side of the opening.
6. At my visit, I saw that some boundary work has already commenced and that the previous conifer hedge has been removed. From what I have seen in the appellant's photographs which show an excessively high hedge in poor condition, that has resulted in an improvement to the street scene by the removal of an unsightly hedge and the opening up of the site. The existing brick piers at the driveway entrance have remained at the same height with a further pier at the eastern end of the site having been raised to match and capped with black stone cappings, as proposed in the plans. This has created some consistency across the boundary and as there are only three piers in total at a height of just under 1.8m, the result is not unduly oppressive and is acceptable.
7. I saw that the existing wall between the piers has been raised in matching brickwork from the previous height of some 0.67m to around twice that height. This is not shown in the plans and I am therefore unable to consider that as part of this appeal.
8. I have considered the appeal on the basis of what is proposed in the plans, ie. that the wall would remain at its previous height with horizontal slatted aluminium fencing above of 1m in height in an 'anthracite' colour, positioned to match the height of the brick piers. The overall height of the proposed boundary would be acceptable because 1.8m is not unduly high, particularly as two of the existing piers are of a similar height.
9. Whilst aluminium fencing proposed is a material not seen elsewhere in this part of the street scene, the appeal dwelling has a contemporary appearance with horizontal cladding and dark grey windows and the style of the proposed fencing would be consistent with that. Its dark, muted colour would not stand out in the street scene and the open slats would allow some glimpses through of the dwelling, garage and front garden. As the two sections of the front boundary are reasonably short at only 3m and 6m and are broken up by the wide driveway opening, it would not be overly dominant in the street scene.
10. The Council's concern that this proposal would set a precedent for all properties in the area is unjustified because there is a wide variety of properties and each case would be considered on its merits. In this case the proposal is justified because it results in a significant visual improvement from the previous boundary, is of an acceptable length and height and its materials reflect the character of the dwelling.
11. I conclude then that the proposed wall and fence would not result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and would accord with development plan policies 7 of the Whittlesey Neighbourhood Plan 2021-2040

(2023) and LP16 of the Fenland Local Plan (2014) which together seek to ensure that proposals make a positive contribution to the character of an area and are visually attractive.

Conditions

12. As the development is already partially constructed, the standard commencement condition is unnecessary. A condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, to provide certainty. A condition for matching external materials is also necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the site and the area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would accord with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that. The appeal should be allowed.

Sarah Colebourne

INSPECTOR