



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 June 2025

by **E Heron MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N2345/D/25/3364079

186 Victoria Road, Preston, Lancashire PR2 8AJ

- 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 Javid Patel against the decision of Preston City Council.
 - The application Ref is 06/2024/1221.
 - The appeal development is described as: "Replacement boundary facing Victoria Road and Garrison Road (Retrospective)."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council has not found harm in respect of the low brick walls and piers, the widened vehicular access, or the vertically boarded fencing enclosing the rear garden, beyond the side elevation of the dwelling. I see no reason to disagree. The remainder of the fencing is described as horizontally boarded in the appeal submission, and I have used this description in my decision. I have determined the appeal on this basis.
3. In determining this appeal, as it involves a site located within a conservation area, I have had regard to section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed horizontally boarded fencing on the character and appearance of the area, including Fulwood Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The site is within the Fulwood Conservation Area. It is significant for its cohesive pattern of residential development, of Victorian and early 20th century origin. This includes a sense of spaciousness, with wide pavements, street trees and space to the front and sides of dwellings. Low boundary walls topped with hedges is the prevailing frontage boundary treatment.
6. The appeal site is a large, detached dwelling sited at the junction between Victoria Road and Garrison Road. As it is a corner plot, the boundary treatment wraps around both streets, and is prominent within the conservation area. Prior to development taking place, the dwelling was set back behind a low brick wall, with hedging behind it. The dwelling and its boundary treatment contributed to the

significance of the conservation area for these reasons. There was also a vertically boarded timber fence providing privacy to the rear garden.

7. The proposed horizontally boarded fencing, even with the presence of a laurel hedge, has a solid and bulky appearance and bears no resemblance to other boundary treatments in either Victoria Road or Garrison Road. As such the fencing is a conspicuous and alien feature within the street scene. It fails to comply with the guidance in the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD), to respect the character of conservation areas through maintaining high quality design details.
8. I acknowledge that the horizontally boarded fencing is intended to be temporary whilst the laurel hedge is sufficiently established to provide effective privacy. However, the hedge may take several years to grow to this extent, and the appellant has suggested the fence would need to be in situ for 3-4 years. Ultimately the development harms the significance of the conservation area, albeit on a temporary basis. The public benefits of the scheme, including the enhanced privacy that would be provided to the occupants of No 186 Victoria Road, do not provide a clear and convincing justification for the harm that would occur.
9. For these reasons, I conclude that the horizontally boarded fencing would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area, including Fulwood Conservation Area. As such, the development conflicts with the aims and objectives of Policy 16 of the Central Lancashire Adopted Core Strategy, Local Development Framework, July 2012, and Policies AD1(a), EN8 and EN9 of the Preston Local Plan (2012-26). Amongst other things these policies seek to safeguard heritage assets from inappropriate development, to ensure development makes a positive contribution to and be in keeping with, character and local distinctiveness, and to comply with the SPD. It would also fail to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework requirement to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Heron

INSPECTOR