



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 May 2025

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/25/3360799

17 Hastings Drive, Flixton, Trafford, M41 8TG

- 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 Eric Grubb against the decision of Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 115041/HHA/24.
 - The development proposed is replacement/maintenance of garden fence. New fence 6ft high. Old fence approx. 5ft high.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Eric Grubb against Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council and this is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matters

3. The development the subject of this appeal has already taken place.
4. The Council's officer's report refers to an enforcement case at the appeal site relating to a 6ft fence next to the highway¹.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow situated within a residential area characterised by the presence of one and two-storey semi-detached dwellings. Dwellings tend to be set back from the road behind front gardens and/or parking areas and have gardens to the rear.
7. The setting-back of dwellings from the road combines with the presence of low front boundaries, gaps between dwellings, planting and occasional street trees to provide the area with a significant sense of spaciousness and greenery.

¹ Reference: 24/00260/NIA.

8. Like many neighbouring properties, the appeal dwelling is set back from the road behind a front garden and a short driveway. However, unlike neighbouring properties, the front garden is separated from the pavement by a noticeably tall panelled fence.
9. During my site visit, I noted that the tall fence draws attention to itself as an incongruous feature due to the absence of other tall fences to the front boundaries of dwellings. Rather, other dwellings in the area have a variety of much lower front boundaries, including low walls, hedgerows and low panelled fences.
10. I also observed during my site visit that the harm arising from the above is exacerbated as a result of the tall panelled fence appearing out of proportion with the relatively low height of the appeal dwelling. This is particularly noticeable due to the nearby presence of taller dwellings with much lower front boundary features.
11. Further, whereas the majority of the frontages of neighbouring dwellings are visible above their low front boundaries, the development results in views to the front of the appeal dwelling being largely obscured by a tall fence. The fence itself draws the eye, not only because of its incongruous scale, but also as a result of its stark, blank appearance.
12. Given all of the above, I find that the development appears as an unduly dominant feature, out of keeping with its surroundings and to the detriment of the area's green and spacious qualities.
13. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the development harms the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan (2024) and to the Council's SPD², which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

14. In support of the development, the appellant refers to a neighbouring fence at Number 4 Hastings Drive. However, this fence does not front that dwelling but provides a boundary to its main garden which is located to the side of the dwelling and consequently, it does not provide for direct comparison with the development the subject of this appeal.
15. The appellant also refers to other fences elsewhere. However, there is nothing before me to demonstrate that the circumstances relating to these other fences are so similar to that the subject of this appeal as to provide for direct comparison. Notwithstanding this and in any case, I have found that the development results in significant harm and this is not something mitigated by the presence of other developments elsewhere.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR

² Supplementary Planning Document SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations (2012).