



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2018

by David Cross BA (Hons), PGDip, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st January 2018.

Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/D/17/3181383

14 Glaisdale Road, Yarm, Stockton on Tees TS15 9RN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Colin Boulton against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/1279/RET, dated 11 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 26 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as "extended fence approx. 4 ft wide x 10 ft in length on existing property, height approx. 6 ft".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.
3. At the time of my site visit, I saw that the fence was in place and I note that the application has been submitted retrospectively. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located on the corner of the junction between Glaisdale Road and the cul-de-sac of Potto Close. Due to this location the site is prominent in views from the highway, and in particular makes an important contribution to the streetscape of Potto Close.
6. The appeal site is part of a housing estate which is characterised by open plan front gardens. Although the proposal is located adjacent to the rear garden of the host dwelling, the landscaped strip enclosed by the fence would provide an important visual buffer between the hard edge of the means of enclosure and

the adjacent footpath. Although nearby open plan front gardens and other open space retain the landscaped character of the area, the appeal proposal will detract from this character due to the extent of the fence and its prominent location at the entrance to the cul-de-sac. The fence will therefore appear as an obtrusive feature which detracts from the open landscaped character of this area of the estate.

7. My attention has been drawn to other properties in the area where fences have been extended to the footpath. Indeed, the Council's Highways, Transport and Design Manager has not objected to the proposal on the basis that these set a precedent for the development. However, I saw that the properties referred to do not reflect the wider character of this open plan estate. Furthermore, I do not know the circumstances of the properties and I note that the Council state that there are no known relevant planning approvals for the fences. In any event, those that I saw served to confirm that the extension of fences to the edge of the footpath has a stark and unsympathetic effect on the streetscape.
8. I conclude that the proposal will harm the character and appearance of the area due to the loss of soft landscaping on a prominent site and the introduction of an obtrusive feature into the streetscape. The proposal will therefore be contrary to Policy CS3 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2010 which states, amongst other things, that development should make a positive contribution to the local area. The proposal will also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of requiring good design and ensuring that developments are visually attractive as a result of appropriate landscaping.
9. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all material planning considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR