

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

29th February 2012

APPEAL OUTCOME – 80 LONGFELLOW CLOSE, WALKWOOD

APPEAL MADE AGAINST REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION

PLANNING APPLICATION DETAILS: 2011/192/COU

**PROPOSAL CHANGE OF USE OF OPEN SPACE TO GARDEN AREA
AND ENCLOSURE WITH FENCING**

LOCATION 80 LONGFELLOW CLOSE, REDDITCH

WARD HEADLESS CROSS & OAKENSHAW

**DECISION DECISION MADE BY OFFICERS UNDER DELEGATED
POWERS 11TH AUGUST 2011**

The author of this report is Steven Edden, Planning Officer (DM), who can be contacted on extension 3206 (e-mail: steve.edden@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk) for more information.

Discussion

The case related to the proposed change of use of an area designated as incidental open space in the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No 3. The appellant wished to use the area as private garden by enclosure of the land with close board fencing to a height of 1.8 metres. The planning application was refused for the following reason:

1. The site is an area of incidental open space which contributes to the quality of the urban area and as such will normally warrant protection from development. The Council considers that the need for this development does not outweigh the current value of the land as an open area and that the proposed development would harm the character and visual amenities of the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies R.2 and B(BE).13 of the Borough of Redditch LP No.3.

Officers sought to defend that reason through written representations to the Planning Inspector.

The Inspector, like officers, noted that the overall design of the estate includes for the main part, open plan frontages to the houses and grassed areas adjacent to corner plots and that the area in question makes a positive contribution to the overall feeling of openness along this part of Longfellow Close.

**PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

29th February 2012

The Inspector considered that the enclosing of this area would be out of character with the general open design of the original estate and considered that the fencing would be visually prominent within the wider street scene harming the visual amenities of the area. She agreed with the Council that the planting which the appellant proposed in front of the enclosure would not overcome the significant harm that enclosing the incidental open space would have upon the character and appearance of the area.

Appeal outcome

The planning appeal was DISMISSED. Costs were neither sought nor awarded.

Further issues

None.

Recommendation

**The Committee is asked to RESOLVE that
the item of information be noted.**