



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 August 2025

by **P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/D/25/3367947

395 Green Lane, Finham, Coventry, CV3 6EJ

- 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 Krishna Pulipaka against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2024/0001430/HHA.
 - The development proposed is Installation of fence on the roadside boundary of the property and garage conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Installation of fence on the roadside boundary of the property and garage conversion at 395 Green Lane, Finham, Coventry, CV3 6EJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/2024/0001430/HHA, and the plans submitted with it.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of the development in the banner heading above from the council's decision notice, as this gives a more accurate description of the development.
3. The fence has been erected, and the garage conversion is complete. Therefore, I am considering this appeal retrospectively.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached house on the corner of Green Lane and Droylesdon Park Road. It is one of a group of 5 houses that share similar characteristics, including front projecting flat roofed porches, entered from the side and joined to a garage, and open front gardens with lawned areas either side of a front drive and turning area. The garage has been converted into a gym with the door replaced by a window. The council has accepted this part of the development, and I agree that it is an acceptable design.
6. The close board fence along the side of the front garden, adjacent to the pavement on Droylesdon Park Road, comprises four, 1.8m high, panels which step down to

four, 1m high, panels towards the junction with Green Lane. The front of the garden remains open to the pavement.

7. Principle 9 of the council's Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) advises that close board wooden fences should only be used for rear boundaries and that fences adjacent to the highway should be no more than 1.2 m high. However, it is common on corner plots for high fences to be located adjacent to the pavement to prevent passersby from being able to see into rear gardens. Whilst the 1.8m section of fence extends beyond the appeal site rear garden, it aligns approximately with the higher section of boundary wall on the corner plot opposite, which similarly steps down creating a rhythm matched by the appeal development.
8. I note that close board wooden fences are common in the front gardens of properties along Green Lane, particularly south of the appeal site, and therefore contribute to the varied character of the street scene. Consequently, the fence at the appeal site does not appear out of character as the council suggests. Whilst not conforming with Principle 9 of the SPD, the development meets the objectives of the guidance, in that it reflects the rhythm and materials of boundary treatments elsewhere within the street that contribute to its character, and thus it meets the requirements of Policy DE1 of the Coventry Local Plan (2017) which states that development proposals must positively contribute towards the local identity and character of an area.

Conclusion and Conditions

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.
10. Planning permission is sought retrospectively therefore no time limit for the commencement of development is required. Because the development has already been constructed, there is no need to specify the plans to be followed or the materials to be used in construction. No other conditions are necessary.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR