

(SLP) which sets criteria against which new development is to be assessed, including its appearance and relationship with the surrounding area.

6. The appellant has referred to examples of a number of other fences/walls in the wider area. However, the majority of these define the side of properties on corner positions and do not bound the front of dwellings in the way the appeal property does. Whilst I note that the example referred to in Hawkstone Close encloses the front of a dwelling, I do not consider the existence of this fence good reason to allow the appeal given the harm the proposal causes to the character and appearance of the locality.
7. I appreciate that the fence was erected to aid security and to prevent dog fouling problems and that the new owner of no 9 has no objections to the proposal. However, I do not consider that these matters outweigh the harm I have identified the proposal causes.
8. I recognise that, to a small degree, the fence restricts visibility for drivers of vehicles leaving the drive of either no 9 or no 11 Kielder Close. However, given the speed at which I anticipate vehicles would be travelling at the head of the cul-de-sac, I do not consider that this would give rise to any significant pedestrian or highway safety problems. I therefore find that the proposal has no conflict with policy GP1 of the SLP, with regard to its requirement to assess the proposal in relation to the provision of satisfactory access. However, notwithstanding this conclusion I consider the harm to the character and appearance of the area to be of overriding importance and for that reason alone the proposal should not be allowed.
9. For the above reasons, and having regard to the views of local residents and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Malcolm Rivett*

INSPECTOR