
Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 23/08/16

**gan Kay Sheffield BA(Hons) DipTP
MRTPI**

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru
Dyddiad: 31.08.2016

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23/08/16

by Kay Sheffield BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers
Date: 31.08.2016

Appeal Ref: APP/H6955/D/16/3152656

Site address: 2 Richmond Road, Wrexham, LL12 8AB

The Welsh Ministers have transferred the authority to decide this appeal to me as the appointed Inspector.

- 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 Craig Jones against the decision of Wrexham County Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P/2016/0268, dated 14/03/2016, was refused by notice dated 27/04/2016.
 - The development proposed is to replace a 215cm hedge with a 180cm high fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The fence subject of the appeal has already been erected. However, the Appellant has indicated it is not complete with regards the colour and the capping to the posts and top edge of the fence. I have taken this into account in reaching my decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies in a predominantly residential area. It is a corner plot located at the junction of Richmond Road with Box Lane. The properties in the immediate vicinity of the site are generally set back from the road with landscaped frontages enclosed by a low brick wall. Several properties in the wider area have fences on top of or set back slightly from the boundary walls in order to enclose the plots. However, the majority of neighbouring dwellings have used planting to enclose the gardens.
 5. The main elevation of the appeal dwelling faces towards Richmond Road. As the dwelling is set close to the rear boundary of the plot there is little useable amenity space behind the property. The area between the side elevation and Box Lane therefore forms the main private garden to the dwelling and is looked out onto from the patio doors to the main living room and a kitchen window.
-

6. Whilst the mature hedge on the boundary with Box Lane prevents views of the garden and the dwelling from the road, the evidence indicates that the remainder of the hedge failed to provide satisfactory enclosure of the plot, to the detriment of the privacy of the occupants. The replacement of the hedge with the fence has enclosed the garden and provides a level of privacy which the appellant and his family could reasonably expect to enjoy in their use of this part of the garden.
7. Nevertheless, the appeal site is located in a prominent position in the street scene. The definition of the boundary by the erection of the fence has created a dominant feature which is out of character with the boundary treatments found on Richmond Road and this part of Box Lane. Whilst the Appellant has indicated that the fence could be finished in a different colour, I do not consider this would be sufficient to successfully integrate the fence into its surroundings.
8. It is accepted that there are properties in the wider area which have fences on the boundaries with the highway. Of the examples drawn to my attention by the Appellant I noted during my site visit that the dwellings on Jeffreys Road show a mix of walls and fences, the appearance of which is softened by the overhanging planting. The example cited on Chester Road also shows similarities with the appeal proposal. However, I do not have details of the planning history of any of these cases and I am therefore unable to draw a direct comparison between them and the appeal before me, which I have treated on its merits.
9. It is therefore concluded that the development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policy GDP1(a) of the Wrexham Unitary Development Plan which requires all new development to make a positive contribution to the appearance of the nearby locality.
10. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Kay Sheffield

INSPECTOR