



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 March 2025 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by Mr A Spencer-Peet BSc(Hons) PGDip.LP Solicitor (Non Practising)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J4423/D/25/3358352

15 Kingswood Avenue, Sheffield S20 6SB

- 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 and Mrs E Harley against the decision of Sheffield City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/03172/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as 'erected boundary fence adjacent Highway.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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. From my site visit I saw that the development had been completed. The development appears to be in accordance with what is shown on the submitted plans, although in any event I have dealt with the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans.
4. Since the application was determined, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in December 2024. I have had regard to the latest version of the Framework in reaching my recommendation.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site is a single storey detached bungalow occupying a corner plot fronting Kingswood Avenue and Kingswood Grove. The area is mainly residential consisting of other detached dwellings with gardens to the front and rear.
7. The prevailing character of the area is that of openness with open frontages to dwellings. There are however intermittent examples of hedging and modest fences to the side and rear of properties. Be that as it may the modesty of the majority of boundary treatments creates an open character and appearance with a sense of spaciousness.

8. The fence installed appears as a dominant, stark and unwelcoming visual barrier that fails to reflect the open character of its immediate surroundings, resulting in an uncharacteristic and incongruous feature in the street scene with a lack of visual permeability. By virtue of its design the fence is not readily assimilated into the prevailing character of the area. Its prominence is further exacerbated by its dark material pallet appearing at odds with the boundary treatments seen within the surrounding area.
9. There are limited examples of other tall boundary treatments in the local area. The examples evident are of various heights, with some referenced by the appellants as setting a precedent. However, I observed such examples to be limited in number and they do not represent a defining or prevailing positive characteristic boundary treatment in the surrounding area. In any event, I do not know the circumstances of those examples or the development plan policies that applied at the time of their consideration. Furthermore, those examples that were seen and which used similar materials, served to confirm that such forms of development adversely affects the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
10. I also note the presence of the previous fence boundary treatment at the appeal site with a tall accompanying hedge. However, whilst similar in height the lack of a verdant presence with the new scheme results in a harsher more industrial appearance which does not assimilate with the appeal site's domestic setting within the cul de sac.
11. It is noted that the Council has referred to Policies BE5 and H14 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998), and the guidance contained within the Designing House Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance from the Unitary Development Plan, within the Decision Notice. However, those policies and the cited Supplementary Planning Guidance appear to concern new or refurbished buildings and extensions to houses. The proposal is a retrospective application for the erection of a new fence and, consequently, these policies and the associated guidance on extensions do not appear relevant to the appeal proposal.
12. Nonetheless, for the reasons given above, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with Policy CS74 of the Sheffield Development Framework Core Strategy (2009) which, amongst other things, seeks to maintain and enhance the city with high quality development. For the same reasons, the proposal would also fail to accord with the provisions of the Framework in respect of achieving well-designed places.

Other Matters

13. The appellants outline the benefits of the proposal, such as an increase in privacy for the current and future occupiers of the host dwelling. However, whilst those benefits are acknowledged, it has not been demonstrated that there are no alternative forms of boundary treatment, which would integrate into the surrounding character of the area, and which would serve the same purpose in terms of providing privacy.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. The proposal would not accord with the development plan, when taken as a whole, and there are no material considerations of sufficient magnitude to indicate that the

appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Mr A Spencer-Peet

INSPECTOR