



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2020

by E Symmons BSc (Hons), MSc

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/19/3239749 62 Elloughton Road, Brough HU15 1AL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Elaine Farnill against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01887/PLF, dated 20 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is 470mm x 470mm smooth rendered pillars to replace damaged brick pillars to front of property fronting on to Elloughton Road, with 2.1m high wrought iron fencing with electric gates.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. During my site visit it was evident that the fencing, rendered pillars and associated gates had been installed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. This three storey semi-detached appeal property fronts Elloughton Road and sits between two more modern properties on the flanking Hunter Road and Chantreys Drive respectively. Elloughton Road is relatively long having a generally verdant character which is due to the predominance of mature hedging and shrubs as a front boundary treatment to the properties. There are other boundary treatments present including fences and, as seen on the two more modern flanking properties, low brick walls.
5. The property frontage is laid to gravel and provides parking. The constructed boundary treatment consists of light grey metal fencing sitting between, what is described on the submitted plans as 2.5 metre high, smooth rendered pillars topped with peaked coping stones. A newly planted laurel hedge sits inside the fence line with additional small laurel plants outside the fence at the back of the verge.
6. No substantive evidence has been provided by either main party regarding where the property boundary sits. I therefore have no certainty that the laurel

hedging planted outside the fence line could be retained and mitigate the presence of the fence into the future. However, even if I were to consider that these plants are within the property boundary, in order to achieve the stated height of two metres to mitigate the appearance of the fence, the hedge would also need to significantly increase in width. The appellant has provided no evidence to support the view that this could be accommodated within the property ownership.

7. The boundary treatment dominates views of the property detracting from its period features. It is prominent within the streetscape particularly since the flanking properties have low walls to the front. The hedge inside the fence line could, over time mature and soften the appearance of the boundary treatment. However, the prominent fence would still be present and visible from the public realm and its appearance does not reflect and detracts from the verdant character and appearance of the area.
8. Other examples of access gates have been cited, in particular 8 and 18 Elloughton Road. I observed both properties during my site visit and although they do have relatively high gates, both house styles and their boundary treatments, when taken as a whole, were different from the development before me. In any case, I have no knowledge of the planning history of these properties and each situation must be determined on its own merits.
9. I have considered whether a condition requiring the gates to be painted a different colour would make the development acceptable. However, considering the overall design and resultant mass relative to the property and those around it, I do not consider that this would resolve my concerns.
10. The boundary treatment incorporating fencing, pillars and access gate are an incongruous feature which harm the character and appearance of the area. The development therefore conflicts with Policy ENV1 of the East Riding Local Plan 2012-2019 Strategy Document (2016). This policy, amongst other matters, seeks that development safeguards and respects the character and appearance of the area and contributes to a sense of place.
11. For the reasons stated above, the appeal is dismissed

E Symmons

INSPECTOR