



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2025

by K Williams MTCP (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N2535/D/25/3363760

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/2025/00107.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Planning application for 4 sections of railings on the front boundary wall and retrospective Planning application for retention of 4 piers above 1m from the ground level'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Sath Vaddaram against West Lindsey District Council. This is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. The application is partly retrospective, the four brick piers had been erected, but not the railings. These were attached to a wall, with taller gate piers (one of the taller gate piers had been accidentally knocked down). The appellant has also stated that the application did not include the wall below 1m in height, the gates and the gate piers which are shown attached to the proposal. I have therefore proceeded on this basis.
4. There is also some dispute between the parties in respect of the gates and two gate piers and 9.99cm wall excluded from the application. Within the context of an appeal under section 78 of the Act it is not within my remit to formally determine whether the proposed development or any other development requires planning permission as suggested by the appellant. If the appellant wishes to ascertain whether the wall, gate and gate piers are lawful, they may make an application under section 191 or 192 of the Act.

Main Issues

5. The main issues is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. Detached houses set well back from the highway, within generous and, on the whole, well-vegetated plots contribute to the spacious and leafy character of

Wragby Road. I saw that a variety of materials are employed in front boundary treatments, however wooden fencing and railings are common, alongside low brick walls, and these are often accompanied by brick piers and hedgerows. Indeed hedges are the principal boundary treatment to some plots and this further reinforces the area's sylvan character. Moreover, this aspect of the area's existing character, close to rural fields taken together with the enclosing effect they have on the streetscene and the screening of the houses behind them all contribute considerably to the semi-rural character and appearance of the area.

7. The proposal seeks permission for four brick piers of approximately 2.8 m in height. These are positioned at regular intervals along the entire length of the 9.99 cm high brick wall. Vertical metal railings of 2.4m in height would be installed between the piers and larger gate piers. The brick used, and the railings are intended to reflect and complement that of the main dwelling.
8. The visual effect of the proposal cannot be disaggregated from the 9.9m wall in particular. The piers and railings alongside any gates or gate piers or wall would be seen as a whole and as single entity. The resultant visual effect cannot simply be separated from elements they are attached to, in the same way the visual effects of an extension to a house is not solely considered without how it affects the appearance of the host property or the composition of the resultant structure overall.
9. The 9.99 cm high wall almost covers the entire width of the plot frontage. The number of brick piers proposed and their spacing along the stretch of wall upon which they be situated would draw attention to the width. Whilst proposed brick and railings are high quality, they would be imposing, and overtly urban in their character. This combined with the proposed height and solid design of the brick piers in particular would form a hard built feature across the site frontage that would draw the eye when walking or driving past the site and from homes nearby.
10. The boundaries of homes on the northern side of Wragby Road tend to have some lengths of soft landscape boundaries. However, whilst ground planting and vegetation and trees would grow through the proposed railings, the imposing brick piers would still appear as dominant elements. In any event, there are no landscape details before me. The proposal would erode the verdant character of the streetscene and consequently appear as a discordant and urbanising feature in stark contrast to semi-rural character of the area.
11. I readily accept that boundary materials and their scale are varied in the surroundings of the appeal site. However, I have limited details regarding the properties and their boundaries at Manor Road, Scothern Lane and Sudbrook Gate. The pictures are not extensive, and the evidence does not suggest that they represent comparable development. Although there are other tall or solid boundary treatments nearby at 1, 5, 11, 19, 24, 30, 45, 73, 55 and 65 Wragby Road. Visually these appeared to be less imposing. None of them exactly reflected the proposal before me in terms of the exact design or composite site frontage coverage as the proposal before me. I have considered the proposal on its own merits, as the presence of other development does not automatically justify development which is found to be harmful.
12. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. As a result there would be conflict with Policy S53 of

the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (April 2023) and Policy 9 of the A Neighbourhood Plan for Sudbrooke 2018-2036 (made 2019). These policies collectively seek amongst other things to ensure that new development, including alterations, relates well to the site, reflects and enhances existing character and distinctiveness. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework where it seeks to achieve well designed places and that development add to the overall quality of the area. For similar reasons, the proposal would not align with National Design Guide in the same regard.

Other Matters

13. I note there have been no concerns raised by the Council in respect of highway safety, biodiversity, trees or the living conditions of nearby residents. Similarly the Council has not identified that the proposal would infringe on any important or specific views. These are different matter to how the site is seen within the streetscene and the effect on the character and appearance of the area. The absence of harm in these respects weigh neither for nor against the proposal.
14. The appellant has referred to security, and I can appreciate the need for enclosure on a busy main road. However, it is not clear if a lower or other form of defensible boundary could perform a similar function. Nor is it clear that other security measures have or could be considered. There is no evidence before me, that the piers provide structural support for the 9.99 cm wall as there is no such survey before me. Accordingly, none of these other matters, either taken individually or together, alter my conclusion in respect of the main issue.

Conclusion

15. 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. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

K Williams

INSPECTOR