Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2025

by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date:14 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H0520/D/25/3370368
36 Park Avenue, Little Paxton, Cambridgeshire PE19 6PE

- 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 Gary Sampson against the decision of Huntingdonshire District Council.
- The application Ref is 25/00717/HHFUL.
- The development is the erection of a boundary fence around the side and rear portion of the garden area.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. It is considered that the main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The development includes the erection of a wooden fence which substantially encloses the side and rear amenity area of the host property which is situated at a junction comprising Park Avenue and Park Drive. Accordingly, the fence bounds the footways along Park Avenue and Park Drive. There is a further section of fence extending from the footway of Park Avenue to the front elevation of the appeal property which is visible from Park Avenue. The property's front garden is also enclosed by a wood picket style fence which is over a metre in height.

4. On the opposite side of Park Drive from the property is an area of public amenity space. Along the north side of Park Avenue, the dwellings are predominantly bungalows that are set back from the footway to the rear of front gardens which are landscaped and used for parking. Fronting the footway and between the gardens the means of enclosure are low walls, fences and hedges.

5. Other than the property, the front gardens of the semi-detached 2-storey dwellings on the south side of the road are open or have a low wall with taller vegetation behind. There are similar means of enclosure along Park Drive. The siting of the dwellings, their front gardens and the public amenity space contribute to the streetscene adjacent to the property having an open character and appearance.

6. As identified by the appellant, within the wider residential area there are examples of dwellings sited on corner plots which have been enclosed, in whole or part, by wooden fences and walls of between 1.8 and 2 metres in height. The planning circumstances of these taller walls and fences have not been provided, and they do not detract from the predominant means of enclosure fronting the roads being walls and fences of a lower height. Further, the curtilages of the land enclosed the taller fences and walls is generally not as extensive as exhibited at the appeal property. Accordingly, limited weight is given to these other schemes in the determination of this appeal.

7. By reason of its extent along the footways, the fence which has been erected is a visually prominent feature within the streetscene along both Park Avenue and Park Drive. The extent and height of the fence mean it is a conspicuous and incongruous form of development which fails to make a positive contribution to the open character and appearance of the streetscene around this road junction. The quality of the fence's materials does not alter this judgement.

8. For the reasons given, it is concluded that the scale of the development does cause harm to the character and appearance of the streetscene and, as such, it conflicts with Policies LP11 and LP12 of the Huntingdonshire Local Plan. Amongst other matters, these policies require development to responds positively to its context and contribute positively to the area's character and identity.

Other Matters

9. Whether the means of enclosure should be a wall rather than a fence, as indicated in the guidance contained in the council's *Huntingdonshire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document*, is not a matter for determination because it is the existing fence that is the subject of the appeal.

10. The appellant claims that the fence is required for the safety of family members and pets but no cogent science has been provided to support the claims. It is therefore judged that these personal matters do not outweigh the unacceptable harm which has been identified. Accordingly, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

D J Barnes

INSPECTOR