



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 November 2018

by **Katie McDonald MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 November 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/M2325/D/18/3209256

23 Avalon Drive, Freckleton, Preston PR4 1PE

- 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 Mrs Bianca Abbott against the decision of Fylde Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 18/0195, dated 5 March 2018, was refused by notice dated 30 July 2018.
 - The development proposed is a 1.8 metre high timber fence with gates to Newton Close boundary.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development is taken from the appeal form and the Council's decision notice as this is more accurate and concise; but I have not included 'retrospective application' as this is not an act of development.
3. From the observation on my visit and the evidence before me, the development is retrospective and I have considered the appeal on this basis.
4. Since the Council's decision, the Fylde Local Plan to 2032 (FLP) was adopted in October 2018. This means that Policy HL5 of the Fylde Borough Local Plan As Altered (October 2005) has been replaced by Policy GD7 of the FLP. The new policy has the same principles as the previous one in relation to design. The appellant was provided with the opportunity to comment, yet no comments were received.

Main Issue

5. This is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The site is a semi-detached bungalow that occupies a corner plot on Avalon Drive and Newton Close. The area has a suburban, open and low density residential character, comprising semi-detached bungalows set back from the road. Low height brick walls are a prevalent, consistent and distinctive characteristic in the area. The walls act as boundary treatments, but facilitate highly visible front and side gardens, which contribute towards an open, high quality and pleasant environment.

7. The development is an approximately 1.8m high timber fence, which has been erected on the top of the original low height brick boundary wall. It projects sideways from the front elevation of the house towards Newton Close and then turns on a right angle to return along the side boundary with Newton Close.
8. Whilst established landscaping is common in the area, particularly to other corner plots, there are very few taller boundary treatments to the fronts or sides of dwellings. Furthermore, despite the good quality workmanship, the fence has an exposed and conspicuous position, sited forward of the build line of Newton Close. Accordingly, in this context, the fence appears as a tall, dominant, unbroken and expansive structure; incongruous to the surrounding street scene. It does not make a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the area, nor does it respond to its context.
9. Consequently, the development has an unacceptable effect upon the character and appearance of the area; conflicting with Policy GD7 of the FLP, which seeks to achieve good design. I also find conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework, which sets out that the creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve.

Other Matters

10. The appellant refers to other properties that have a similar fence, yet no examples are identified. Additionally, although the fence may provide additional security for the dwelling along with protection of the family dog, these other matters do not outweigh my findings above.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Katie McDonald

INSPECTOR