
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025

by **D R Kay BA Dip.Arch RIBA**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V1260/D/25/3361180

2 Jellicoe Drive, Christchurch, Dorset BH23 3SL

- 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 Samantha Osborne against the decision of Bournemouth Christchurch and Poole Council.
 - The application Ref is 8/24/0674/HOU.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a 1.8m high timber fence to replace an existing hedge.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. From my visit it was apparent the development to erect the fence had been carried out. Therefore, the application is for retrospective works, and I have determined the appeal on that basis.
3. The description of development on the Council's decision notice differs from the application form but describes the development more succinctly. I have therefore used this description in the header. However, as the terms 'retain' and 'retrospective' are not descriptions of development, I have omitted them from the description.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a two-storey dwelling constructed in the latter part of the 20th century. It is part of an atypical block of three properties, formed not as a terrace, but as part semi-detached and part back-to-back. The block consists of No. 44 Rodney Drive, the appeal property, No.2 Jellicoe Drive and the adjacent No.4 Jellicoe Drive. The complex layout of the building results in further complexity in the external garden and parking spaces, where parking and garden spaces at No.2 are split, a secondary garden and the parking area being separated from the dwelling.
6. The block sits at the junction of Jellicoe Drive and Rodney Drive. No.2 has its main garden space adjacent to the property and forms the corner, taking its pedestrian and vehicular access from Jellicoe Drive, though its parking area is separated from it by the garden space of No.4. A head height hedge is present around much of this

corner area of garden. A head height brick and timber infill panel boundary treatment enclose the appeal property's secondary garden area and parking area on Jellicoe Drive.

7. The properties within the area consist of a mix of single and two-storey detached, semi-detached and terraced properties, forming a residential estate of which the appeal property is part. Dwellings are constructed from a mix of red or brown bricks to their walls, under pitched roofs finished in red or grey profiled tiles. Frontages are generally open to the rear of public footpaths, with lawns and landscaped gardens or vehicle parking to their frontages, though some have low-level fences. The character of the area is therefore that of an open and spacious, established residential neighbourhood.
8. The appeal development has removed a section of the head height hedge, replacing it with a length of head height timber 'feather-board' fence with an access gate. The position of the fence broadly accords with the position and extent of a single-storey lean-to extension, noted by the Council, as having been constructed following a planning approval in 2021.
9. The appellant has stated that the existing hedge had been affected by the construction of the extension and that parts had died, the fence subsequently being erected for privacy. At my visit it was evident that there would have been little space between the rear of the mature hedge and the Rodney Drive elevation of the extension, which is also close to the rear of the public footpath.
10. My attention has been drawn to other examples of high timber fences within the surrounding area, as precedent for the appeal development. Having viewed these, and the wider area at my visit, there are several examples of high mature hedges and shrub planting, together with a limited number of high timber boundary fences. These features tend to be associated with corner properties, which do not benefit from rear gardens where more privacy might be afforded to their occupants.
11. Whilst the appeal property is indeed a corner property and therefore does not benefit from a private rear garden, it does have areas of garden already made private by their boundary treatments, such that the area where the fence has been erected is not vital to such provision. Whilst the fence would provide privacy to the windows in the extension, this could equally be provided, over time, by a replacement hedge. The fence has introduced an urbanising element, which is at odds with the open and spacious character of development in the immediate area, and which is therefore visually intrusive in the street scene.
12. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It follows therefore, that the appeal development is contrary to policy HE2 of the Christchurch and East Dorset Local Plan – Core Strategy (2014) and saved policy H12 of the Christchurch Local Plan (2001). These require, among other things, high standards of design that respect the key characteristics and special qualities of the area in which development is proposed, and to ensure that they do not result in the loss of important landscape features, such as open space, which is part of the character of the area.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal development would be contrary to the development plan, read as a whole, and that there are no material considerations, including policies in the Framework, that would justify determining other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

D R Kay

INSPECTOR