



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 September 2021

by Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D2510/D/22/3293843

64 Sea Road, Chapel St Leonards, Lincolnshire, PE24 5SA

- 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 Sharon Cooper against the decision of East Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref N/031/01993/21, dated 7 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a boundary fence to a maximum height of 1.95m.
-

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 streetscene

Reasons

3. The appeal property is situated in a prominent position opposite the junction with Skegness Road. The area is predominantly residential comprising dwellings that vary in terms of their age, appearance. Boundary treatments at the front of the dwellings also vary, but they are generally low walls, low fences or hedging.
4. The proposal (which is retrospective) is to retain an existing close boarded timber fence along the site frontage. The fence has been stained a dark grey colour and it has replaced a conifer hedge. It is set-back slightly from the pavement with some planting having been undertaken at intervals in front of the fence. The appellant points to the existence of other fences in the locality and also the need to provide a secure boundary for young children who attend the premises in connection with her childminding business. I have also taken into account the support given to the proposal by third parties.
5. Policy SP10 of the adopted East Lindsey Local Plan 2018 (LP) seeks (amongst other things) to ensure that new development is well designed and enhances the character of the area. This accords with Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework), which requires developments to add to the overall quality of the area, be visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

6. I accept that conifer hedges are not always aesthetically pleasing and that it may have obstructed the pavement and blocked visibility for drivers emerging from the property. However, notwithstanding the planting that has taken place, the appeal fencing is a somewhat stark and unduly prominent structure that appears at odds and out of context with its surroundings, because of its height, length and close proximity to the road frontage. In my opinion, it detracts from the streetscene and, in that regard, it conflicts with Policy SP10 of the LP and with The Framework, as referred to above.
7. In reaching my decision, I have taken into account the requirement to provide a secure and safe environment for young children. However, this could be provided in other ways by, for example, a different type of fence in a different position.
8. I have also had regard to the other fences in the area that have been referred to by the appellant. However, whilst some of these may be comparable, I have assessed the appeal development in relation to the streetscene in which it forms a part and, in that context, the fencing is at significantly at odds with its surroundings.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR