



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 February 2025 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4223/D/24/3354736

2 Miller Meadow Close, Shaw, Oldham OL2 8DT

- 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 Alex Boylin against the decision of Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is HOU/352734/24.
 - The development proposed was originally described as 'Install a fence 2m in height from the back of the house and along the side of my property up to the street sign'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for installation of a fence 2m in height to the rear and side of the property at 2 Miller Meadow Close, Shaw, Oldham, Greater Manchester OL2 8DT, Ref HOU/352734/24, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the Location Plan (1:1250 – 18-Apr-2024) and drawing numbers A102 and TQRQM24109171327249.

Procedural Matters

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.
3. The original description on the planning application form is overly descriptive and uses words which are not a description of development. I have therefore used the description on the Council's decision notice for the purposes of the appeal decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. 2 Miller Meadow Close (No 2) is a two-storey detached property located on the corner of Miller Meadow Close and George Street. The property has tall hedging to the front and external side boundaries. It also has a close boarded timber fence surrounding the rear garden which sits behind the external side boundary hedge and also separates the garden from a neighbouring driveway and garage to the rear. The frontages of properties on both Miller Meadow Close and George Street

are typically open in character, either with no boundary treatments or low hedging, walls or fences. A mix of high railings and wall surround 'Prospect House' to the opposing corner on Miller Meadow Close.

6. The proposed fence would not appear excessive in height for a residential setting and would have a domestic design and material pallet. Although different to the more open character of frontages in the area, in this particular instance it would evidently relate to a side and rear boundary and would be seen in the context of No 2's corner position. Furthermore, the existing hedging to the boundary along George Street and the initial section of Miller Meadow Close would retain a suitably soft planted frontage to No 2.
7. I conclude, the development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area and would therefore comply with Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (2024) which requires that all development respects and acknowledges the character and identity of the locality.

Conditions

8. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

M Russell

INSPECTOR