
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2020

by Louise Nurser BA (Hons) Dip UP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 31 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/19/3227511
51 Hunter Road, Elloughton HU15 1LG

- 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 Mr Andrew Farrer against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 18/04031/PLF, dated 12 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is removal of leylandii hedge to front of property and construction of brick built wall with timber slatted infills. Single brick wall 1800mm high with 300mm buttresses set 1800mm apart.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site sits in a traditional suburban setting of a variety of house types which for the most part share a common building line, are characterised by well-maintained front gardens and drives with low hedging or dwarf walls. This gives an attractive and open aspect to the wider area.
4. In contrast, the proposed development would replace the existing tall privet hedging with a fence constructed of brick piers with buff copings and a brick base with timber slats which would measure some 1.8 metres high.
5. This tall fencing would appear incongruous in the streetscape and out of character with the wider area.
6. I am aware both from my site visit, at which I took the opportunity to walk around the wider area, and from the examples provided me by the appellant that there are examples of boundary treatments which do not accord with the general character and appearance of the wider area. However, these are the exceptions. Rather than supporting the appellant's case, these serve to underline the importance of ensuring that small scale development does not incrementally undermine the distinctive character of an area.

7. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would be contrary to the requirement, set out in Policy ENV1 of the East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document 2016, which remains consistent with the Framework, to have regard to the specific characteristics of the site's wider context and the character of the surrounding area.
8. In coming to this conclusion, I have noted the appellant's personal circumstances, and the representations made from interested parties. I am also aware that the kitchen lies to the front of the house, and that the appellant wishes to continue to enjoy similar levels of privacy afforded by the existing tall hedging. Nonetheless, in the context of the appeal before me I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed for the reasons set out above.

L. Nurser

INSPECTOR