



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2026

by **S McIntyre BSc (Hons), CEng, MICE, MCIHT**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/E3335/D/25/3376652

1 Trevett Road, Taunton, Somerset TA1 5DJ

- 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 Mihai Iacob against the decision of Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref is 38/25/0272.
 - The development proposed is described as “Front property fence (on existing boundary adjacent to the highway) of maximum height 1.9 metres comprising 2 elements: bottom part is made from hollow concrete blocks reinforced with iron and cement for a solid base replacing the existing deteriorated 60 cm tall brick fence - and on top of that is the second part (upper section) which is formed by vertical narrow iron bars up to the overall height of 1.9 metres. These bars would be fixed to vertical concrete pillars reaching just under 1.9 metres in height. The pillars would be spaced at around 2 metres from each other. There is around 8cm distance between metal bars to have visibility. It would have smooth modern finish to complement the house and the ironwork will be finished in black.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The above description of development is taken from the planning application form. It is described as a front property fence, but it is clear from the description of materials and the drawings submitted, that the proposal is a combination of wall, railings and gates. The description of development on the Council’s decision notice was amended to the following:
 - The erection of a boundary wall with metal railings and gates, to the front of 1 Trevett Road, Taunton (retention of part works already undertaken).
3. This is clearer than the description on the application form and this amended version was used by the appellant in their appeal form. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of the amended description.
4. Works have commenced on site, however I have determined the appeal on the basis of the plans submitted with the planning application.
5. The Council’s response to the appeal questionnaire refers to a current appeal on this site (App/E3335/D/25/3375603). That appeal is not before me for consideration and does not form part of my determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

7. The character of Trevett Road is of dwellings set back from the highway with open front gardens or parking areas. Front boundary treatments are typically low red brick walls, sometimes with low hedges behind. There is a similar character in Galmington Road and Ashford Road in the vicinity of the appeal site. The front gardens on Trevett Road provide an open separation between the road and dwellings which creates a spacious appearance to the streetscene. The existing layout plan for the appeal site shows a typical open frontage that would have made a positive contribution to the character of the area.
8. Close-boarded fences are used as boundary treatments to side gardens to 127 and 129 Galmington Road. This includes fencing on Trevett Road opposite the appeal site and on Galmington Road next to the appeal site. However, the front gardens to these 2 properties are bounded by small brick walls with planting behind, similar to other frontages in the area.
9. The development will enclose the front garden and parking area with a high boundary structure comprising wall, railings and metal gates. The railings do facilitate some views into the frontage of the site. However, these would be limited by the close spacing of the railings together with the substantial pillars that form part of the detailed design. Overall the proposal would amount to a high visual barrier, resulting in the loss of spaciousness which is an important element of the character and appearance of the area.
10. The form and materials of the proposal are not a characteristic of the area and combined with the proposed height will appear prominent and incongruous in the street scene.
11. The appellant has provided example photographs of high front boundary treatments for properties in Taunton. The appellant has provided the addresses of these examples but no further information regarding their relationship to the appeal site. However, none of the examples contribute to the character and appearance of the area in which the appeal site is located.
12. The proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area and therefore in conflict with Policy DM1 of the Adopted Taunton Deane Core Strategy (2012), which includes a requirement that the appearance and character of any street scene would not be unacceptably harmed by development.

Other Matters

13. The appellant makes reference to the conduct of the Council but this is not a matter for my consideration in the context of this planning appeal.
14. The appellant refers to the benefits of security and privacy which would arise from the boundary treatment. However, there is limited evidence to substantiate the points which he makes, and it has not been demonstrated that there are no alternatives which would be less harmful to the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, these benefits attract limited weight in favour of allowing the appeal and do not outweigh the harm which I have found.

Conclusion

15. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.

S McIntyre

INSPECTOR