

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 April 2019

**by D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 26 April 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/T1410/D/19/3215605**

**31 Badlesmere Road, Eastbourne, BN22 8TL**

- 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 Liam Grimes against the decision of Eastbourne Borough Council.
  - The application Ref PC/180616, dated 25 May 2018, was refused by notice dated 20 August 2018.
  - The development proposed is to re-locate existing fence line to the edge of the boundary; erect a 6ft tall fence from the garage at the back of the property to inline with the front of the property; where the height of the fence would drop down to 3ft following the boundary edge stopping the fence post 1.5m away from the drive.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the locality.

## Reasons

### *Character and appearance*

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached two storey home on a corner plot. It is within an estate of established residential character with similar houses and a generally 'open plan' arrangement that comes together to form an area of agreeable appearance. The proposal is as described above and would include enclosing the side verge with a screen fence and having a lower fence around the, mainly lawned, front garden.
  4. As I indicate above the estate is quite uniform in character and the open plan nature generally, and sense of space at junctions in particular, has been almost wholly retained over the years. Where there is enclosure or higher elements alongside footways it is almost without fail planting, and this is an attractive proposition. Unfortunately a close boarded fence on the outer edge of a garden as proposed here would not be a pleasing sight. It would look hard and alien and not in character with the neighbourhood. The appeal site is a prominent one and it is important that it does not intrude in an unsatisfactory way into the streetscene.
  5. Saved Policy UHT1 and UHT4 of the Borough Plan 2007 and Policy D10A of the Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 are relevant. Taken together and amongst
-

other matters they seek well designed development that would harmonise with local character and appearance, reflect local distinctiveness, be of appropriate scale and form and positively contribute to an area. I conclude that the proposal would conflict with these policies.

*Other matters*

6. I do understand the wish to enclose more garden and deter people and dogs and I hope that another solution can be found, perhaps with hedging or shrubbery as seen elsewhere. I considered the nearby site drawn to my attention but did not find it directly comparable either locationally or given the fact that the scheme included space in front of fencing and landscape. In any event I must determine the appeal proposal on its own merits. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.
7. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered; the Council's policies which I cite mirror relevant objectives within the Framework.

*Overall conclusion*

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the locality. Accordingly the appeal is dismissed.

*D Cramond*

INSPECTOR