
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 May 2025

by **L Fern BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: **11 JUNE 2025**

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2003/D/25/3363021

22 Chancel Road, Bottesford, North Lincolnshire DN16 3LD

- 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 Miss Ravina Sangha against the decision of North Lincolnshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PA/2024/1474.
 - The development is described as “wooden boundary fence”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above has been taken from North Lincolnshire Council’s (the Council) official decision notice and provides a succinct and accurate description. It differs from that on the application form, which provides details of the appellant’s case, which is unnecessary for a description of development.
3. The word “retain” has been removed from the description of development given that it is not a form of development.
4. I noted from the evidence that the fence has been erected, which was confirmed by my site visit observations. The development has largely been completed in-line with the submitted plans.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the fence on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is located in the suburban area of Bottesford. No 22 Chancel Road (No 22) is semi-detached and has a wraparound garden due to its corner location on the junction between Chancel Road and Cambridge Avenue. For this reason, the property does not benefit from a typical front and rear garden arrangement.
7. Short boundary treatments, such as dwarf walls, interspersed with soft landscaping, are prevalent where the boundaries of properties front onto the public highways of both Chancel Road and Cambridge Avenue. These boundary features create a sense of cohesion and contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area.

8. Anomalies include the boundary treatment to Nos 4 and 5 Peterhouse Court (Nos 4 and 5 respectively) on the opposite side of Cambridge Avenue to the appeal site. To facilitate the provision of a private rear garden space, a taller boundary treatment has been erected to No 4, which consists of a purpose designed dwarf brick wall with piers and fence panelling between.
9. A tall wooden close boarded fence has been erected behind the existing dwarf wall to No 22. The fence stretches along the property's boundary with Cambridge Avenue and part way along its boundary with Chancel Road before returning into the plot towards the corner of the building itself.
10. No 22 has its principal relationship with Chancel Road and despite being set back from the highway, the property is in a prominent and highly visible location on its corner plot within the street scene. The property can be viewed from a substantial distance along Chancel Road in both directions. Therefore, any alterations to the property or its boundary treatments have the potential to affect the character and appearance of the area, either positively or negatively.
11. The fence by virtue of its height and form is more akin to that found bounding rear gardens where privacy and security is required. However, in this case the fence stretches significantly forward of the front elevation of the property and partially across its front boundary, creating a dominant and incongruous feature in a street scene where dwarf and soft boundary treatments are more prevalent.
12. Furthermore, the fence has been retrofitted behind the existing dwarf wall and appears at odds in terms of design with the existing boundary feature. This is in stark contrast to the wall and fence combination at No 4, which forms a cohesive and integral design solution.
13. By virtue of its height, location in a prominent position, siting forward of the front elevation of the building and partially along the front boundary of the property, and its retrofitted design, the fence creates an incongruous and discordant feature to the detriment of the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
14. Accordingly, I find significant harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to policies DS1 and DS5 of the North Lincolnshire Local Plan (2003) and policy CS5 of the North Lincolnshire Core Strategy (2011). These policies seek to ensure that, amongst other matters, development is well designed and is appropriate to its context and the character and quality of an area.

Other Matters

15. I acknowledge that the configuration of the property on a corner plot and with a wraparound garden means that it is challenging to establish an area that is private, secure and appropriate for family living, which is particularly important for children, without higher than usual boundary treatments fronting onto a public highway. However, other properties in the area demonstrate that this can be achieved without the requirement for high boundary treatments significantly forward of the building itself and across the front boundary of the property, thereby maintaining an appropriate relationship with the street scene.
16. Furthermore, I have found significant harm to the character and appearance of the area by way of the general retrofitted design of the boundary treatment, as well as its siting aimed at maximising usable and secure outdoor garden space. For the

above reasons, the personal circumstances forwarded by the appellant do not outweigh the harm found.

Conclusion

17. The proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Fern

INSPECTOR