



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 May 2025

by **Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X2410/D/25/3362669

32 Southdown Drive, Thurmaston, Leicester, LE4 8HS

- 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 Rajeetsinh Karaji against the decision of Charnwood Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P/24/1831/2.
 - The development proposed is erection of 1.8m high fence to existing 1m boundary wall to side of property. 1.8m high double gate, to allow access/security to existing garage to side of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow, which is situated on a corner plot at the junction of Southdown Drive and Westdown Drive. Due to its corner position, the appeal site is visually prominent in the streetscene. The surrounding area is mixed in terms of house types, but a distinctive characteristic in the vicinity of the appeal site is low boundary walls/fencing, with some of the boundaries supplemented by landscaping.
4. The appeal proposal is to erect solid timber fencing and a gate, as described in the heading above. It would be erected along the side boundary facing Westdown Drive, with a short section facing Southdown Drive.
5. The Council considers that the proposal would be an incongruous and overly prominent feature in the streetscene, because of its height, scale and materials. It cites a conflict with Policy EV/1 of the adopted Borough of Charnwood Local Plan 2004 and with Policy CS2 of the Charnwood Core Strategy 2015. These policies seek (amongst other things) to ensure a high standard of design for all new development and to respect and enhance the character of the area. The Councils Supplementary Planning Document – Design reinforces these requirements. In addition, paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (NPPF) contains similar provisions.
6. In reaching my decision, I noted during my site visit that there are other properties nearby that have solid timber fences that enclose gardens. I also accept the appellant's need for privacy and security. However, I consider that the height and design of fencing proposed would appear at odds and out of character with the

predominant form and style of boundary treatment in the immediate vicinity of the appeal property. Consequently, I share the Council's view that the proposal would conflict with the provisions of both the Development Plan and the NPPF, as referred to above.

Conclusion

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

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR