
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2025

by **David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4205/D/25/3371536

55 Hewlett Way, Westhoughton, Bolton, Lancashire BL5 2QZ

- 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 Billie Yates against the decision of Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 20449/25.
 - The development proposed is installation of automated entrance gate to front of dwelling along with retrospective fencing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of the development provided on the planning application form has been replaced by an amended version on the Council's decision notice. I consider that subsequent description to accurately represent the appeal proposal and I have therefore used it within this decision. The description indicates that the proposal seeks retrospective permission for the fencing, and the fencing was in place at the time of my visit.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscape.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is at the head of a cul-de-sac of a pleasant suburban character. A characteristic of the streetscape is the open plan nature of front gardens and driveways. The proposed gate and fencing would extend across a driveway and along the side of the front garden, giving the front of the property an enclosed appearance that would erode the spacious and open character of the plot and the streetscape. As a result, the proposal would be an incongruous and obtrusive feature that detracts from the generally open streetscape of this estate.
5. The appellant refers to the height of the fence compared to the host dwelling. However, even at that height the gate and fencing would be an obtrusive and enclosing feature within this open plan estate. The use of high quality materials would not be sufficient to mitigate for the harm arising from the proposal.
6. Reference has been made to similar fencing and treatment on Hewlett Way and the wider locality, but details of this have not been provided to me and this does

not lead me to a different conclusion on the prevailing open-plan character of the streetscape based on my own observations.

7. Although there are a garage and high fence running along part of the shared private driveway, these relate to a dwelling which has retained its open plan front garden and driveway. These features do not therefore establish a context that justifies the degree of enclosure to the front of the dwelling that would result from the appeal proposal.
8. In support of the proposal, the appellant refers to people accessing the property to view and photograph an adjacent field, as well as children cycling onto the property and damaging vehicles. However, this is a private matter of trespass, and in any event it has not been demonstrated that this occurs so frequently as to justify the proposed enclosure. Reference is also made to delivery vehicles using the driveway as a turning circle at speed. But given that there is a turning head close to the appeal site I am not persuaded that this is a common occurrence that would warrant the erection of the fence and gate. I am mindful of the appellant's concerns about the effect on their privacy and the safety of their young child. However, the rear garden provides a private and safe amenity space for the dwelling.
9. The appellant submits that the fencing has been in place for some time with no objections, although an objection was submitted to the planning application. However, even if no objections had been received this would not negate the harm I have identified.
10. In conclusion, the proposal would lead to an unacceptable degree of enclosure to the front of the host dwelling with significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and streetscape. The proposal would be contrary to the character requirements of Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan 2024 and Policy OA3 of the Core Strategy 2011. The proposal would also be contrary to the advice of the House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document 2012 with regard to boundary features in open plan areas. The considerations raised by the appellant in support of the appeal are not of sufficient weight to negate the identified harm as well as the conflict with development plan policy and adopted guidance.
11. There are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR