



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 March 2025

by **C Walker BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/A2525/D/24/3357380

1 Primrose Crescent, Pinchbeck, Spalding PE11 3RT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Simon Pacey against the decision of South Holland District Council.
 - The application Ref is H14-0692-24.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Replace existing boundary and brick dwarf wall with new 1.837m high brick wall and piers'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council have amended the description of the development from that on the planning application form. I note the appellant agreed to this amendment. I have therefore determined the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a bungalow located on the corner of Primrose Crescent with The Chase in Pinchbeck. The neighbourhood is predominantly residential, comprising both single and two storey dwellings of various designs, yet constructed in a broadly consistent material palette. Dwellings in the area tend to be set back a similar distance from the back edge of the footpath and where their frontages are defined, typically it is by low brick walls and/or hedgerows. The consistent use of low frontage walls adds to the sense of visual cohesion in the locality.
5. A low brick wall defines the appeal site frontage, which wraps around the corner and across the front of the neighbouring property at 4 The Chase. A tall evergreen hedgerow also sits behind the boundary wall of the appeal site.
6. Raising the height of the proposed front boundary wall would starkly contrast against the lower walls nearby, resulting in an incongruous feature within the street scene. The height and expanse of the wall for the full length of the boundary, immediately adjacent to the back edge of the footpath, would be a heavily engineered feature that would be unduly prominent. The harm would be

exacerbated because the existing wall reads as one continuous feature wrapping around this corner, providing a sense of visual cohesion at this prominent location. By contrast, the development would disrupt this run by dominating and jarring with the existing wall which it would abut. This would result in a visually awkward boundary arrangement that would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.

7. At my site visit I observed that the existing hedgerow is tall and well maintained. I am, however, mindful that planting falls outside of the planning regime and its removal is not an act of development in itself. In any event, even at its present height and width, being a natural feature, this hedgerow does not have the same harsh, deadening effect on the street-scene as an engineered feature that the development would comprise. Therefore, this is not comparable and doesn't affect my findings on this main issue.
8. The appellant cites a number of examples¹ of similar boundary walls within the locality in support of their appeal. However, unlike the appeal site, none of these examples bound the frontages of the dwellings that they are associated with. Rather, they form the side boundaries where they do not obscure the main architectural features of the dwellings. Consequently, these examples do not share the same context and are not directly comparable to the appeal before me.
9. Therefore, I find that the development would have an unacceptable adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. This would be in conflict with Policies 2, 3 and 30 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 (2019) which together, set out expectations for development. Amongst other things, they require development to be appropriate for the character and appearance of the area and the relationship to existing development. They expect proposals to create a sense of place by respecting the scale and visual closure, have an appropriate distinguishment between private and public space and should not lead to unacceptable adverse impacts on the amenities of the area.

Other Matters

10. It has been put to me by a local resident that this appeal proposal would improve the line of sight at the junction, when exiting Primrose Crescent onto The Chase, as the wall is not as high or as wide as the existing hedge. It is not clearly articulated how this would assist with visibility. No issues with the existing arrangement have been cited by the Council or their professional highway officer and this is consistent with my observations on site. Without substantive evidence, I see no reason to disagree. Therefore, I attribute only limited weight to this matter.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations which outweigh the adverse effects on the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, the appeal fails.

C Walker

INSPECTOR

¹ As set out within the appellants Statement of Case comprising 17 Fennell Road, 51 Rotten Row, 2 Poachers Gate and 1 Dairy Close, all in Pinchbeck.