
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2026 by Kim Vo MPLAN

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/D/25/3376534

2 Lingfield Road, Manchester M11 4JZ

- 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 Felix Chum against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 143181/FH/2025.
 - The development proposed is described as being for “a new 1.8m high fence to the front and right boundary with white brickwork, concrete pillars and navy timber hoarding and black wrought iron gate to the front entrance.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for “a new 1.8m high fence to the front and right boundary with white brickwork, concrete pillars and navy timber hoarding and black wrought iron gate to the front entrance” at 2 Lingfield Road, Manchester M11 4JZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 143181/FH/2025, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing numbers: LR-R00-PR-101 – Revision R00; LR-R00-PR-102 – Revision R00; and LR-R00-PR-104 – Revision R00.

Appeal Procedure and Main Issue

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal scheme. The main issues in regard to which are its effect on a) the character and appearance of the area and b) the living conditions of the occupiers of Number 4 Lingfield Road (No. 4) with specific regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site occupies a prominent corner plot in a residential area at the junction of Lingfield Road and North Road. The front garden is enclosed by metal railings. The surrounding area features a mix of boundary treatments of varying heights, materials and colours. Lingfield Road itself has a wide, open feel, with a carriageway flanked by pavements, parking bays and properties being set well back behind front gardens and driveways. Together, these features influence a spacious street scene, which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.

4. The proposed fence would be taller, more solid in appearance and result in an enclosure of the front garden. It would also be clearly visible from public vantage points. However, its height and design would appear similar to other taller fences erected nearby. These include the corner plot properties at Numbers 1 and 3 Lingfield Road (Nos. 1 and 3). Whilst there is a suggestion these are unauthorised, the evidence before me indicates that the fence at No. 1 has been in place for many years. As such, it is an established part of the street scene. The proposal would sit comfortably alongside it, integrating well with the surrounding area.
5. Openness along Lingfield Road would still be maintained, due to its spacious character and the wide corners of the junction. The fence would also follow the alignment of the existing boundary, and due to the triangular shape of the plot, its visible extent would be largely confined to the frontage along Lingfield Road. The proposed design and materials are typical of domestic boundary fencing. Consequently, its height and siting would not result in an incongruous feature.
6. For these reasons, the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, it would comply with Policies SP1, EN1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy 2012 (CS) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Together, and amongst other things, these seek proposals to create well-designed places, provide opportunities for good design to enhance the overall image of the City, and have regard to appropriate siting, layout, scale, form, massing, materials and detail.

Living Conditions

7. No. 4 is the adjoining dwelling. The proposed new fence would be of a locally standard height and restricted to the front and side boundaries, set away from No. 4. Due to the intervening distance it's impression to the occupiers of No.4 would not be significant. Views from the front garden and out of the ground floor front window would not be unacceptably impinged upon given they would be otherwise uninterrupted, particularly forwards and to the right. It would, therefore, not result in an unacceptable reduction in the quality of this occupier's outlook. The new iron gate would also allow views through, providing sightlines between the appeal site and No. 4's front paths, and the pavement.
8. The proposal would not therefore harm the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 4 with specific regard to outlook. As such, it would comply with Policies SP1 and DM1 of the CS and the Framework. Together, and amongst other things, these seek for development to have regard to the effects on amenity.

Other Matters

9. Policy EN1 of the CS is primarily concerned with design principles and strategic character areas. Saved Policy DC1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester 1995 and Policies JP-S1 and JP-P6 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document 2024 relate to residential extensions, focus on tackling climate change through sustainable developments, or addressing health inequalities. These are not directly applicable as the appeal scheme is for a new boundary treatment. The other policies I have cited in my conclusions on the main issues are sufficient to make a finding in accordance with the development plan.
10. The effects of the proposal on highway safety and the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with specific regard to light were not matters of dispute in

the appeal. I have no compelling reason to find otherwise. Given that I have found no harm on the main issues, I have not investigated the matter of a lower fence height. The cost of repairing a neighbour's fence is a private issue. It is not disputed that the proposed fencing is to be contained within the appellant's land.

Conditions

11. To provide certainty and for enforcement purposes, it is necessary to impose the standard time limit and specify the approved plans. The materials are shown thereon and are acceptable. There is therefore no need for a further condition.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed given it would comply with the development plan and there is nothing compelling to suggest a decision other than in accordance therewith.

Kim Vo

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted, subject to the conditions set out above.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR