



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2025 by Sara Manson DipTP

### Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10<sup>th</sup> October 2025

---

### Appeal Ref: APP/R4408/D/25/3369938

#### 19 Wilthorpe Road, Redbrook, Barnsley S75 1JB

- 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 Sarah Parry against the decision of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is 2025/0057.
  - The development proposed is the replacement of existing boundary wall at front of property, with a combination of brick wall and fencing to a maximum height of 1.5 metre. (Approximately 1 metre of which would be solid and the upper approximately 0.5 metre would be a perforated style fencing). Extension to existing drive opening, new driveway gates and separate pedestrian gate, to tie in with the height and style of the front fencing to a maximum height of 1.5 metre. Widening of existing drop kerb to accommodate new driveway gates.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Appeal Procedure and Main Issues

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. The main issues in which is the effect of the proposed development on a) the character and appearance of the area; and b) highway safety.

### Reasons for the Recommendation

#### *Character and Appearance*

3. The application property is a semi-detached dwelling located on a classified road that experiences constant and heavy traffic. The immediate area is defined by a variety of house types, with most featuring front gardens and driveways, some of which are gated. The predominant use of low boundary walls and mature hedges along front gardens enhance the area's pleasant open, green character that contributes positively to the street's appearance.
4. The proposals would, by virtue their overall height, be visually intrusive, creating a dominant and enclosing presence on the plot, contrasting sharply and unacceptably with the open and landscaped character of the surrounding area. The impact would be intensified by the extensive hardstanding that has replaced the former front garden, contributing to a harsher, more engineered appearance. While the proposed fencing above the wall would have a degree of permeability, its design and detailing would introduce elements that would appear incongruous and out of character with the surrounding area.

5. Of the photographic examples of other local boundary treatments cited across the local area, the full planning history of each is not available to me. I am unaware of their planning status and the finer details such as the circumstances and context which prevailed at the time. It also remains unclear whether these treatments were implemented recently. The exception is Number 79 Barnsley Road, where I note that the approved wall was of a similar height to the pre-existing fencing, and the approved plans notably excluded a gate due to highway safety concerns. As such, these examples do not sufficiently alter my earlier findings.
6. Consequently, the proposed development would conflict with Policy D1 of the Barnsley Local Plan 2019 (LP) and guidance contained in the Walls and Fences Supplementary Planning Document 2019. Amongst other things, these seek to ensure that development complements and enhances the character and setting of the area through its design, height and materials used.

### *Highway Safety*

7. It is unclear as to whether a vehicle parking on the plot frontage would be able to turn within it to ensure it could always exit forwards. Even if such a manoeuvre were feasible, the driver's visibility would be significantly compromised by the height, position and solid nature of the gate pillars, wall and topped fence panels. This restricted visibility would increase the potential for conflict with pedestrians, cyclists, and other road users. Should a vehicle need to reverse into the plot, it would temporarily obstruct the carriageway, impeding the free flow of traffic when a vehicle would stop in the carriageway to commence the manoeuvre.
8. Conversely, should a vehicle have to reverse out of the access, there is potential for the same effect for the same reasons, with the added problem of more of the exiting vehicle occupying the public highway before the driver would be able to see sufficiently well into the carriageway. This would be exacerbated by the constantly active nature thereof. The scheme would therefore be unacceptable in highway safety terms.
9. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to Policy T4 of the LP which, amongst other things, requires new development to have regard for highway safety. The National Planning Policy Framework states planning permission should be refused if there is an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

### **Other Matters**

10. The appeal scheme may improve security for the site's frontage, but it remains unclear as to whether this could not be achieved through other, less harmful means. Neither this, nor the lack of objection from neighbouring properties which would be a neutral matter, would therefore make the scheme acceptable.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal proposals would conflict with the development plan and there are no sufficiently weighty material considerations to indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Sara Manson*

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

**Inspector's Decision**

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

*John Morrison*

INSPECTOR