



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2025

by **C Skelly BA (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D2510/D/25/3371941

The Beeches, Main Road, Stickney, Lincolnshire PE22 8AD

- 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 Mrs Suzanne Barham against the decision of East Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref is S/169/00145/25.
 - The development proposed is removal of 7ft hedges to the front of the property. Erection of 6ft wall to replace the hedges.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. From my site visit I saw that the construction of the boundary wall has been completed. The development appears to be in accordance with what is shown on the submitted plans, although in any event I have dealt with the appeal on the basis of the said plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a two-storey, detached dwelling which faces onto the A16 road, which runs through the settlement of Stickney. I observed that the appeal property is set back from the road, which limits views into the habitable rooms on the ground floor. Whilst there is a small front garden, the property has a large, enclosed rear garden which affords private areas for the enjoyment of outdoor space. It adjoins the driveway which runs along the side of the neighbouring takeaway premises, next to which is a car repair garage. At the time of my site visit, a takeaway van was operating in between the takeaway and garage. Although there is a mix of styles and materials, front boundary treatments are generally low level in appearance which provides an open character to the street scene.
5. The development is a 1.8m high brick wall which runs along the front boundary, adjoining the A16. The solid appearance of the brick wall, in combination with its height, is a discordant feature in the street scene which is not in keeping with the existing local character of low-level front boundary treatments. Whilst I note that the wall replaces a previous hedge of similar height, this would have had a softer,

natural appearance in comparison to the dominant, harsh appearance of the brick wall with its lack of impermeability. Although there have been no objections from the Council's highways team with regards to safety or access concerns, the solidity and height of the wall provide an enclosed appearance to the front of the property, interrupting the open aspect of the street scene and thereby harming the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

6. I conclude that the development harms the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Hence, it is contrary to Policy SP10 of the East Lindsey Local Plan (2018), which seeks amongst other things to ensure that new development is well designed and enhances the character of the districts towns.

Other Matters

7. I have had regard to the rights of the appellant under Article 1 of the First Protocol and Article 8 of the Human Rights Act 1998. Article 1 of the First Protocol states that every person is entitled to the peaceful enjoyment of their home. Article 8 affords the right to the respect for private and family life. Dismissal of the appeal would interfere with the appellant's rights under both Article 1 of the First Protocol and Article 8. However, these are qualified rights, and any interference may be justified where it is in accordance with the law and is necessary in a democratic society, applying the principle of proportionality.
8. The appellant contends that the wall is required to provide privacy from vehicles and pedestrians using the adjoining takeaway business. I acknowledge that the consequence of dismissing the appeal would have the potential to reduce privacy at the appellant's home. However, I have not been provided with any evidence as to why another softer, less intrusive, more permeable front boundary treatment would not provide sufficient levels of privacy for the appellant. Therefore, the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the area is such that dismissal of the appeal would be a proportionate and necessary response that would not violate the appellant's rights under Article 1 of the First Protocol or Article 8.
9. The appellant refers to the lack of communication by the Council in relation to the takeaway business, however this is not a matter for me in the determination of this appeal.

Conclusion

10. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.
11. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Skelly

INSPECTOR