



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2025 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by Kenneth Stone BSc (Hons), DIP TP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D4635/D/25/3365576

45 Woodfield Heights, Wolverhampton, WV6 8PS

- 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 C Price against the decision of Wolverhampton City Council.
 - The application reference is 25/00178/FUL.
 - The development proposed is relocation of existing side fencing.
-

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.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a dwelling situated at a corner plot in a residential area. It is located towards the top of Woodfield Heights where the dwellings are set amongst trees and plants which contributes to a verdant character. The existing side fence at the appeal property is set in from the pavement. This allows for an appreciation of the open space to the side of the dwelling which includes a large tree and planting, features which complement the street scene. Together with the abundance of landscaping in the area including at the corner plot opposite, the appeal site therefore contributes positively to the open and verdant character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposal is for a gravel board and timber fence along the boundary line at the appeal site. While the height and materials of the fence would be similar to some boundary treatments in the area, as a result of its prominent siting at the pavement edge, it would have a stark and enclosing presence in the street scene. In addition, due to its considerable length and height together with its solid design, the fence would erode the spacious and green characteristics of the corner plot. The fence would therefore be an incongruous feature in the street scene and would detract from the open and verdant character and appearance of the area.

6. I acknowledge that there are some similar boundary treatments along Woodfield Heights, including those in the photographs provided by the appellant. I observed these on my site visit. However, these do not generally reflect the prevailing open and verdant character of this part of Woodfield Heights and the appeal site in particular. Furthermore, there is limited evidence before me of the circumstances in which these fences were installed in order to give them significant weight. Consequently, these fences do not set a precedent which justifies the proposal.
7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policies D4, D6, D7, D8 and D9 of the Wolverhampton Unitary Development Plan (2006) (UDP) and Policy ENV3 of the Black Country Core Strategy (2011), which amongst other matters, seek proposals which respond positively to the surroundings and that boundary treatments should make a positive contribution to the locality.

Other Matters

8. I accept that the proposed development would provide a safer and more functional private garden space for the appellant's family. It would also prevent the land being littered on and walked across by passerby. However, while I acknowledge that the proposal would benefit the appellant in this regard, this does not justify the harm of the proposal to the character and appearance of the area that I have identified.
9. Similarly, the absence of harm in terms of highway or pedestrian access is not a benefit as such and is not in itself a matter which would lead me to a different conclusion on the appeal overall.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would conflict with the development plan and there are no other material considerations which would alter this finding. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Kenneth Stone

INSPECTOR