



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2022

by K Ford MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E2530/D/22/3304474

1 Roxburgh Road, Stamford, Lincolnshire PE9 2XE

- 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 Sarah Blades against the decision of South Kesteven District Council.
 - The application Ref S22/1045, dated 19 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2022.
 - The development is retrospective erection of a new 1.8m height closed board fence along a public highway on the east and south boundary line of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have used the description of development as it appears on the appeal form as it accurately describes the development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a 2-storey semi-detached residential dwelling in a prominent location on the corner of Roxburgh Road and Sutherland Way. Properties are set back behind driveways and front gardens with low boundary treatments where they are present creating an open and spacious character.
5. A 1.8m high wooden fence that has been erected around the front garden of No 1 Roxburgh Road. The height, position and location of the boundary treatment on a prominent corner is a notable incongruous addition at odds with the open character of the area.
6. I note the appellant's reasoning for erecting the fence. However, this is outweighed by the harm of the development to the character and appearance of the area.
7. The appellant has referred to other boundary treatment used on other properties in the area in support of their case. No specific examples were provided and I did not see any of the size and nature of the appeal scheme at

the time of my site visit. In any event, each case is determined on its own merits and my assessment is based on the information before me.

8. The development harms the character and appearance of the area and therefore conflicts with the part of Policy DE1 of the South Kesteven Local Plan which requires new development to make a positive contribution to the character of the area and not have an adverse impact on the streetscene.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons identified, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

K Ford

INSPECTOR