



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2026

By Ian McHugh DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 August 2026

Appeal Ref: 6010250

Egmont, 23 Wragby Road, Sudbrooke, Lincoln, LN2 2QU

- 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 Mr Sath Vaddaram against the decision of West Lindsey District Council.
 - The application Ref is WL/2026/00063.
 - The development proposed is the retention of two piers to front boundary wall, provision of reduced railings and minor amendment to previously approved gates.
-

Procedural Matters

1. The description in the banner heading is taken from both the planning application form and the Council's decision notice. However, I consider that it should be amended to include the wall upon which the railings will be attached. The appellant did not include that in the description, because he considered part of the wall to be permitted development. In my opinion, development cannot be disaggregated in that way, as the wall is an integral part of the overall structure.
2. Consequently, I have considered the proposal as the erection of a front boundary wall and railings and amendment to previously approved gates. Following consultation, both parties have agreed to this description.
3. On 17 August 2026, the Government published the National Planning Policy Framework 2026 (NPPF). It does not contain any provisions that raise material issues in respect of this appeal and I have not found it necessary to seek comments from the main parties. Where relevant, I have made reference to the 2026 version in my reasoning below.

Decision

4. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a front boundary wall and railings and amendment to previously approved gates at Egmont, 23 Wragby Road, Sudbrooke, Lincoln, LN2 2QU in accordance with the terms of the application Ref WL/2026/00063, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:1250 scale Site Location Plan – L-ADD-025-01B; 1:500 scale Block Plan – L-ADD-025-02C; and 1:50 scale Entrance Gates and Wall – WRA023-04.

Application for costs

5. Applications for costs have been made Mr Sath Vaddaram made by against West Lindsey District Council and by West Lindsey District Council against Mr Sath Vaddaram. These are the subject of separate decisions.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including the effect on trees on the site frontage that are covered by a tree preservation order.

Reasons

7. The appeal site is located within a row of ribbon development that stretches along Wragby Road. Planning permission was granted by the Council in 2019 to demolish the original dwelling on the site and erect a new detached dwelling and garage. At the time of my site visit, the new dwelling was under construction.
8. Approval was also given by the Council in 2020 for gate piers and a sliding gate. These were the subject of a condition attached to the planning permission for the new dwelling.
9. Frontages along Wragby Road vary in terms of their means of enclosure, but generally, trees, hedges and other vegetation provide a verdant character and appearance to the area. However, there are also properties that are enclosed by walls or by walls and railings. These include numbers 47, 59 and 65.
10. I also note that the appeal property is located within Character Area 5, as defined in the Sudbrooke Neighbourhood Plan. This states that properties on the northern side of Wragby Road are screened from view by a combination of formal hedgerows and more sprawling and substantial areas of tree planting. It also states that it is only the driveway entrances to these properties where the band of planting is momentarily broken.
11. More recently, an application which was described as being for “four sections of railings on the front boundary wall and retrospective planning application for the retention of four piers above 1m from the ground level,” was refused by the Council and subsequently dismissed at appeal (reference APP/N2535/D/25/3363760).
12. The description considered by the previous inspector was not, in my opinion, particularly clear at first reading, but essentially the proposal was to construct a wall, gates and railings along the site frontage, with the wall containing four tall piers.
13. Both the Council and the Inspector concluded that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. The current appeal proposal seeks to address the previous application and appeal decisions by deleting two of the wall piers and reducing the height of the railings. A laurel hedge is proposed behind the wall and railings.
14. The Council maintains its previous stance, stating that the proposal would be incongruous and out of character with the existing streetscene. It also states that no Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) has been provided and there could be

harm to trees adjacent to the wall and railings caused by its construction. The trees are the subject of a preservation order.

15. The Council cites a conflict with Policy S53 of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan and with Policy 9 of the Sudbrooke Neighbourhood Plan. These policies seek (amongst other things) to ensure that the design of new development is of high quality and contributes positively to local character. In addition, the Council also refers to conflict with the National Design Guide and the NPPF 2024, which contain similar provisions. The 2024 version of the NPPF has been replaced by the 2026 publication. The relevant provisions contained in the new version are similar to those in the 2024 and I have considered these in my assessment of the proposal.
16. In reaching my decision, I have given close consideration to the recent planning history. In particular, I have studied the reasoning and conclusion of the previous inspector and considered the need for consistency in decision making.
17. Whilst the length and basic form of the boundary wall, railings and gates have not changed, the removal of the two piers and the lowering of the railings are significant differences between the two proposals, which, in my opinion substantially reduces the bulkiness and visual impact of the development. Consequently, I consider that there is a material difference between the current appeal development and the earlier proposal.
18. With regard to the impact on the adjacent trees, I note that this was not an issue with the previous application and appeal. Whilst good practice would normally dictate the carrying out and submission of an assessment, in this case the wall has already been constructed and the appellant states that the gates can be constructed off the earlier foundations. Therefore, there would appear to be little gained by the request for an AMS.
19. A further consideration, which I consider to weigh in favour of the proposal is that the trees and other vegetation, including any new planting would be visible behind, through and above the railings. As a result, the verdant appearance of the site frontage would not be lost.
20. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal does not conflict with the provisions of the Development Plan, as referred to above.

Conditions

21. As the development has already commenced, the only condition necessary is one that lists the approved plans.

Conclusion

22. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal be allowed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR