



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 January 2019

by **Jamie Reed DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 January 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/D/18/3212910

32 Pacific Drive, Thornaby, Stockton-on-Tees TS17 8GS

- 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 Chloe Chantell against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/2816/RET, dated 10 November 2017, was refused by notice dated 24 August 2018.
 - The development proposed is erection of gates/metal railings to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modern semi-detached dwelling situated on an estate of similar properties. The estate is characterised by the dwellings having small grass frontages which are partially enclosed with metal railings of uniform appearance approximately 1 metre in height. Many of the dwellings have driveways positioned to the side. At the time of my visit, it appeared that many if not all of these driveways were open in appearance, without gates.
4. I noted at my visit that the metal railings to the front have already been erected. These are positioned along the common boundary to the front and are approximately 2 metres in height where they adjoin the appeal property, reducing down in height until meeting the existing metal railings to the front. The back of these new metal railings are then finished with metal sheeting, which results in them being of a solid appearance.
5. Both the gates and metal railings introduce features that are uncharacteristic of the estate and as such appear incongruous within the context of the streetscene and as such are contrary to Policy CS3 of the Stockton-on-Tees Core Strategy Development Plan Document, section 8 of which requires development to contribute positively to the local character of the area. The proposal also fails to accord with the objectives of paragraphs 127 and 130 of the NPPF, which seek to encourage development to be sympathetic to the local character of the area, and say that permission should be refused for

development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area. I therefore conclude on the main issue that the fence would materially harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such it would conflict with Policy CS3 and the aims of national policy in the NPPF

6. The appellant has explained that the need for the fence has arisen in order to provide privacy from the neighbouring property. Nonetheless, whilst I sympathise with a desire for privacy and security, this does not overcome the visual harm that would be caused to the area. In any event, the ownership and occupancy of property changes over time, and these personal reasons are insufficient to justify an unsatisfactory development'

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jamie Reed

INSPECTOR