
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 October 2025

by **D M Young JP BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI MIHE**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J2210/D/25/3370153

36 Park View, Sturry, Kent, CT2 0NR

- 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 Mrs Violeta Tataran against the decision of Canterbury City Council.
 - The application Ref is CA/25/00947.
 - The development proposed is a retrospective application for the installation of a 2m fence and sliding vehicular gate to front and side boundary
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the fence and gate on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located within an unremarkable post-war housing estate within Sturry. While I acknowledge that the Park View street scene is not particularly sensitive in townscape terms, there is nonetheless a pleasing rhythm to development with houses set back from the road behind shallow front gardens. The great majority of dwellings along Park View and intersecting estate roads are either open fronted or enclosed by low walls and/or mature landscaping.
4. Against that background, the development is unlike anything else I saw in the vicinity. While the materials are not necessarily objectionable, it is simply the excessive height of the fence along with its proximity to the back of the footway. The result is a discordant and highly conspicuous element in the street scene.
5. While I acknowledge the security and privacy benefits of the development to the Appellant and his family, these do not justify the significant harm that has been caused to the character and appearance of the area. I also note that the Appellant has offered to paint the fence in an attempt to reduce its impact on its surroundings. While that might assist, it would not by itself be sufficient to reduce the visual effects outlined above which realistically can only be addressed through a significant reduction in the height of the fence and gates.
6. The Appellant has referred to other fences in the area being the inspiration for the development. However, no specific examples have been provided and I was unable to locate any boundary treatments in the immediate area that were remotely comparable.

7. For the above reasons, I find that the development would conflict with Policy DBE3 of the Canterbury Local Plan 2017, insofar as it seeks high quality design that reinforces and positively contributes to its local context creating attractive, inspiring and safe places.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

D M Young

INSPECTOR