

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2020

**by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 14 July 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/20/3251144**

**Bellfield, Arnold Lane East, Long Riston HU11 5HY**

- 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 & Mrs Jenkinson against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
  - The application Ref 19/04235/PLF, dated 12 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2020.
  - The development proposed is erection of wrought iron gates and fence.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and the setting of the Long Riston Conservation Area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached dwelling located on Arnold Lane East which is a no-through road of residential properties of various styles. The property is adjacent to the Long Riston Conservation Area that is characterised by its notable linear form, taking in a range of property styles and uses, in a verdant and rural setting.
4. On my site visit I observed that whilst there were various forms of boundary treatments on Main Street, the street on which the appeal property is located is characterised by low boundary treatments with landscaping, including hedges. This gives the street a sense of openness and a green appearance.
5. The appeal proposal would introduce a dominant and unnatural boundary treatment, which due to its design and height would be incongruous in this relatively open and green setting. It would be out of character with the immediate surroundings. The proposal would be clearly visible from the conservation area and in views towards it from the street on which the appeal site is located. For the reasons identified, the proposal would cause significant harm to the setting of the conservation area. In this instance, there is no clear and convincing justification for any harm to the setting of the conservation area.

6. The appellant has referred to various forms of boundary treatments in the surrounding area, including railings to Riston Church of England Primary Academy. I do not have details of the background to these examples. They do not have the same characteristics as the appeal proposal, and the appeal site and its surroundings. I therefore give them limited weight in the appeal. I have, in any event determined the appeal on its own individual merits.
7. The appellant has also referred to several examples of hedges in the surrounding area of similar height to the proposed railings and gates. I find that such hedges, forming natural features, are more often than not positive features of the area. Their natural appearance is markedly different from the appeal proposal and I therefore draw little comparison to the appeal proposal and give this argument limited weight.
8. The appellant has commented that the proposal is required for reasons of security. Boundary treatments are one of several measures that can be taken to maximise security, however they are not the only measure, and they should not be installed to the extent that they cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. I therefore give little weight to this argument.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed wrought iron gates and fence would have a significantly adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area and the setting of the Long Riston Conservation Area. The proposal would be contrary to Policies ENV1 and ENV3 of the East Riding Local Plan (2016) which require, amongst other things, that development contributes to safeguarding and respecting the diverse character and appearance of the area, be of high quality design and appropriate scale, height and material; and conserve the setting of heritage assets.
10. The proposal would also be contrary to guidance contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) which requires, amongst other things that, permission is refused for development of poor design, and that any harm from development within the setting of a designated conservation area should require clear and convincing justification.

## **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*A M Nilsson*

INSPECTOR