



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 June 2025

by A Phillips MPlan BA CertHE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 JULY 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X3540/D/25/3363317

Weardale, Mill Piece, Nacton, Suffolk IP10 0HQ

- 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 Marcus Armitage against the decision of East Suffolk Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/24/4039/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of Decorative Boundary Fencing, Brick Piers and Timber & Metal Gates with Lavandula Hedging in front
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. During my site visit it was noted that the development had been commenced, though not yet completed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

4. The existing area is a cul-de-sac road primarily defined by open or soft landscaped front boundaries, though some of these have rendered/brick entrance pillar features. In addition, the front elevations of the majority of dwellings are visible from the street. However, it was noted that there were examples of approx. 1.8m high wooden fences; including the property adjacent to the appeal site. Both parties have confirmed that the area is within the designated Suffolk and Essex Coast and Heaths National Landscape Area.
5. The Council has stated that two nearby properties (Lagenfield and Acorns) never received planning permission for their fences, though it does not state if it has taken enforcement action on these fences. In addition, I also noted on site that dwellings on the corner of Mill Piece and Sawmill Lane both have approx. 1.8m high fences forming a side boundary adjacent the highway. However, while it is noted that there are some examples of high and hard boundary treatments the character and appearance of Mill Street is predominantly low and/or soft. The height of the proposed boundary treatment specifically harms the character and appearance of the area, as it is this that makes the development so dominant within the street scene and it blocks views of the principal elevation of the host dwelling. In this regard, the hard boundary treatment is dissimilar from other nearby boundary treatments, and it draws the eye in views along the street.

Moreover, the Lavandula hedge, even when matured, would not adequately mitigate its impact.

6. The materials of the proposed boundary treatment are of a high quality that users both materials found within the street scene, such as the lower-level brick piers, and a high quality alternative of the stone gabion wall to the standard garden fence. However, the choice of materials does not overcome the primary harm from the height of the boundary treatment.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development causes significant harm to the character and appearance of the local area. The proposal, therefore, does not accord with Policy SCLP11.1 in the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan 2020, which seeks to ensure high quality design and development that responds to its context.
8. In addition, the site is within the Suffolk & Essex Coast and Heaths National Landscape. The National Planning Policy Framework requires that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks. As concluded above the proposal harms the character and appearance of the street scene and while the proposal would have a limited impact on the wider National Landscape, this nonetheless further weighs against the proposal.

Conclusion

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

A Phillips

INSPECTOR