



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 May 2025

**by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 20 May 2025**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/B2002/D/25/3362781**

**Springfield, Main Road, Ashby-Cum-Fenby, North East Lincolnshire DN37 0QW**

- 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 Charles Slowikowsk against the decision of North East Lincolnshire Council.
  - The application Ref is DM/0799/24/FULA.
  - The development proposed to erect a new boundary wall with access gates and post / parcel box with alterations to the existing highway access.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal site is a contemporary property located within a village which has a rural setting in which boundary treatments vary and include walls, fencing and hedgerows/landscaping. The appeal site fronts onto a narrow road with the proposed boundary extending along the width of the plot.
4. The proposed wall would comprise a white coloured brickwork with powder coated grey metal panels without gaps, the gates would also comprise metal panels. The boundary would be of modern design to match the appeal property notwithstanding this the features of the boundary would be out of keeping with the setting of the appeal site. Despite the varying boundary treatments in the area, the appeal proposal fails to have regard to the local context and would introduce a stark urbanising form of development into the countryside.
5. The proposed boundary would be an incongruous feature impinging on the openness of the rural area. Whilst the appellant proposes to soften to a degree the appearance of the boundary by setting back the boundary and including roadside landscaping, the introduction of this urbanising development is in stark contrast to the countryside nature of the area.
6. I find that the development would harm the character and appearance of the area.

7. The proposed development would conflict with Policies 5 and 22 of the Planning for Growth, Local Plan 2013 to 2032 (2018) which amongst other things seeks to support the delivery of high-quality design.
8. There is also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) which seeks to ensure developments are of good design appropriate and sympathetic to their surroundings.

### **Conclusion**

9. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

*Chris Pipe*

INSPECTOR