



Penderfyniad ar Apêl

Ymweliad safle a wnaed ar 29/09/10

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29/09/10

gan / by Emyr Jones BSc(Hons) CEng MICE MCM

**Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion
Cymru**

**an Inspector appointed by the Welsh
Ministers**

Dyddiad/Date 13/10/10

Appeal Ref: APP/H6955/A/10/2133252

Site address: 28 Windermere Road, Little Acton, Wrexham LL12 8AN

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 Mrs Shirley Ellis against the decision of Wrexham County Borough Council.
- The application Ref P/2010/0278, dated 31 March 2010, was refused by notice dated 18 May 2010.
- The development proposed is the erection of a Jacksons convex tongue & groove fence positioned on a timber gravel board finished with a diamond trellis, supported by Jackposts, positioned on the property boundary replacing the existing hedge.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Procedural matter

2. As the proposed fence has already been erected, I will consider the appeal as having been made under Section 73A of the *Town and Country Planning Act 1990*, as amended, which relates to planning permission for development already carried out.

Main issue

3. I consider the main issue in this case to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding residential area.

Reasons

4. Means of enclosing front gardens to properties in the area comprise a mix of hedges, low walls and low fences. In contrast the appeal fence is between 1.8m and 1.9m in height and this gives it a visually intrusive appearance in the street scene, particularly when viewed from Merlin Road directly opposite. As a result, its retention would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding residential area and the proposal conflicts with *Wrexham Unitary Development Plan* policy GDP1.

5. I note that the fence was erected to increase privacy, prevent headlight glare and provide shelter from the wind, but other dwellings in the area which are sited opposite junctions do not have such fencing enclosing their front gardens. In any event, these considerations are not sufficient to outweigh the harm and conflict with policy identified above.
6. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Jones

Inspector