



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2025

by **D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/25/3374888

5 Peterborough Close, Ashton-Under-Lyne OL6 8XW

- 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 Maria Munir against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00490/FUL.
 - The development is the erection of 1.8m garden fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. For clarity, the description of development has been taken from the council's decision notice. How the council determined the application is not a matter which is for assessment as part of this appeal. This appeal has solely been determined based upon the planning circumstances of the development.

Main Issue

3. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, in particular the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The development is a circa 1.8 metre high fence comprising wooden panels with curved tops that are hung between concrete posts and erected along the shared boundary between the appeal property's rear garden and the footway along Peterborough Close. The fence replaced a hedge and the appellant claims that it was erected for reasons of family safety and privacy.
5. The appeal property is a detached dwelling located at a road junction situated within a primarily residential area. The surrounding area is characterised by similar types of dwellings albeit there are variations in their design. These dwellings are set back from the footways to the rear of front gardens which are landscaped and used for parking. The front gardens are not enclosed by significant means of enclosure but are either unbounded or separated by vegetation of varying heights. In combination, these factors result in the streetscene possessing an open and verdant character and appearance.
6. The *Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD) refers to wooden panel fencing not being used along a road frontage and that if the surrounding area has a distinctive style of boundary feature the aim should be to

harmonise with what exists. However, the SPD can only be guidance and cannot take into account all planning circumstances.

7. The type of fence erected is typical of a means of enclosure for a domestic garden. However, within the streetscene only a limited number of similar fences were observed during the site visit within the surrounding residential area, including enclosing the rear garden of 57 Brecon Crescent which is visible from the turning head of Peterborough Close. Where dwellings are sited at road junctions, including 1, 9 and 35 Peterborough Close, the boundaries enclosing their rear gardens shared with the footways are substantial hedges. These hedges make a positive contribution to the open and verdant character and appearance of the streetscene.
8. By reason of its length and siting adjacent to the footway, the fence is a visually prominent and conspicuous feature within the streetscene along Peterborough Close. The appeal scheme does cause unacceptable harm because it fails to respect the open and verdant character and appearance of the streetscene. It is an unsympathetic form of development within the context of the predominant means of enclosure fronting roads within the surrounding residential area.
9. There is an absence of any vegetation associated with the appeal scheme to provide some relief from the visual prominence of the fence. This contrasts with the wooden fences associated the rear gardens of, for example, 9 Peterborough Close and 57 Brecon Crescent, where the appearance of these fences is broken up, in whole or part, by vegetation.
10. It is judged that the identified unacceptable harm to the open and verdant character and appearance of the surrounding area, in particular the streetscene, demonstrably outweighs the appellant's claims concerning the erection of the fence for safety and privacy reasons.
11. Accordingly, it is concluded that the development causes unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the, surrounding area, in particular the streetscene, and, as such, it conflicts with Policies C1 and H10 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan. Amongst other matters, these policies refer to proposals understanding townscape and respecting the nature of the surrounding fabric, and for there to be suitable landscaping and fencing which enhances the appearance of a housing development. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR