



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2025

by **A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z4310/D/25/3371783

90 Victoria Road, Aigburth, Liverpool L17 6DJ

- 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 Ross Kirkpatrick against the decision of Liverpool City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25H/1317.
 - The development proposed is described as: "to retain boundary treatment works including rendering and installation of fencing."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The original description of development included extraneous detail not constituting development, so I have adopted the more concise wording from the Council's decision notice.
3. As the application was retrospective, I was able to assess the development as built.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the development on: i) the character and appearance of the area; and ii) highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site occupies a prominent corner position at the junction of Victoria Road and Carnatic Road. The surrounding residential area features a mix of front boundary treatments including walls, fences, and hedges of varying height. However, the properties immediately adjacent to the appeal site are defined by low walls and metal bar gates, which contribute to an open and visually cohesive streetscape at the junction.
6. The composite fence panels installed above the original plinth wall, along with matching solid gates, ranging in height from approximately 1.7m to 2.1m across the frontage, presents a stark contrast to the adjoining boundary treatment in both scale and materiality. Due to the site's prominent location, the visual impact of this development is particularly pronounced. Its height and solid form appear highly incongruous with the more modest boundary treatments on either side, disrupting the established rhythm and cohesion of the streetscape at this point.
7. While taller boundary walls exist on the north side of Carnatic Road, they are associated with significantly larger properties and do not share the same visual

relationship with the development on the south side of the street. Additionally, although tall hedges on the opposite side of Victoria Road contribute to a sense of enclosure, they lack the same hard-edged, permanent character of the composite panels. As such, the presence of tall walls and hedges elsewhere in the wider area does not mitigate or justify the visual harm caused by this development in such a specific and prominent location.

8. In conclusion, the development causes unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It conflicts with Policies UD1, UD7, and H7 of the Liverpool Local Plan (2022) (the LP), which, among other requirements, seek to ensure that development respects local character and context.

Highway safety

9. The Council is concerned that the height and solid construction of the boundary treatment may impede visibility for vehicles exiting the site and for pedestrians using the adjacent footway.
10. However, the vehicular access is onto Carnatic Road, a residential street with low traffic volumes and reduced vehicle speeds. Additionally, vehicles emerging from the driveway are likely to do so at low speeds, and their presence would not be unexpected to pedestrians in this residential environment. There is no substantive evidence to suggest that the development has compromised the safe operation of the driveway.
11. Accordingly, the development does not give rise to an unacceptable impact on highway safety, and so, complies with LP Policy TP8 in this regard.

Other Matters

12. The fencing and gates contribute to increased privacy and a greater sense of security for the occupiers. However, these private benefits must be balanced against the public interest in preserving the established character of the area. In this case, the visual harm caused by the boundary treatment is considered to outweigh the private advantages.
13. While the composite panels may offer environmental advantages such as durability and minimal maintenance requirements, these do not sufficiently offset the adverse visual impact in this particular context.
14. The appellant's proposal to install an electric vehicle charging point in the future would support wider sustainability objectives. However, this measure is not directly relevant to the planning considerations in this appeal, which focus specifically on the boundary treatment.

Conclusion

15. The development causes significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and conflicts with the development plan when read as a whole. No material considerations have been presented that would justify a decision contrary to the development plan. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR