

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 September 2025

by **S Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP (Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D2510/D/25/3367070

28, Lewis Avenue, Sutton on Sea, Mablethorpe, Lincolnshire, LN12 2JS

- 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 Miss Patricia Taylor against the decision of East Lindsey District Council.
 - The application reference is N/110/00194/25.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a boundary fence to a maximum height of 1.83 metres.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appeal is made retrospectively for development already constructed.
3. The appellant has described the proposed development as *'remove 5ft wooden fence panels, 6 ft posts and gravel boards. Replace with *3 wooden panels and post(duplicating property opposite, as shown in photos 1+2). The remaining fence is 1.83 mts chain link fencing that can be seen through and does not obstruct view'*.
4. I have used the description of development from the local planning authority (LPA) refusal notice in the banner heading above as it is more concise.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a detached bungalow situated on a corner plot and located amongst other residential properties of a similar age and which, in the main, have open plan gardens creating a spacious, open development which adds distinctively and positively to the locality.
7. On my site visit I was able to see that, while the housing area is characterised as I have described, several dwellings have low picket-type fencing of about one metre in height to their front amenity spaces, and at least two (at Nos. 21 and 36 Lewis Avenue) have close boarded fencing of approximately two metres in height to side

gardens and to which the appellant refers by way of precedents. However, I have no evidence before me as to the planning histories of these fences, or indeed of any of the other fencing in the immediate area. In addition, the two cases mentioned by the appellant have such fencing to a much more limited extent to their boundaries than the appeal property, and by the material used and their extent, they have a significantly different and less jarring visual impact. I do not consider that they set a precedent, and in any event, I have determined the appeal upon its individual planning merits.

8. I understand that the appeal property has previously been surrounded by 5-foot-high wooden boundary fencing. Again, I have not been provided with any planning history details relating to it. The dwelling is now surrounded by three wooden fencing panels (in order to provide some privacy to the rear garden area) while the remaining boundary of approximately 31 metres consists of green chain-link fencing with a height of approximately 1.8 metres.
9. By its height, extent, design and appearance, I find that the development fails to assimilate well into the area and adversely affects its character and appearance. It has an overall dominating, incongruous impact and detracts unacceptably from the otherwise more open and spacious character experienced in the street-scene.
10. I am conscious that the occupants of other properties in the immediate area, while having generally open front garden areas, have more private spaces to the rear, whereas this is somewhat denied to the appellant because of its corner plot location. However, I consider that privacy requirements may be capable of being explored by considering a more sensitive planting scheme to part of the boundary, towards the rear of the property and which would still maintain the generally open and spacious nature of the majority of the residential curtilage.
11. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development does not accord with policy SP10 of the Lindsey Local Plan 2018, or with chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2025, both of which require well designed development which maintains and enhances the character and appearance of the area within which it is located.

Conclusion

12. There are no material planning considerations that indicate that the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

S. Hartley

INSPECTOR