
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 March 2022

by C Coyne BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25/04/2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/22/3292527

6 Station Road, Gilberdyke, Brough, East Yorkshire HU15 2SU

- 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 Paul Coulthard against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02038/PLF, dated 11 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is retention of boundary fence and erection of detached leisure building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. When on my site visit, I observed that the proposed boundary fencing had already been erected. I also note that the application was submitted retrospectively. Notwithstanding the boundary fencing being in place, I have considered the appeal based on the plans originally submitted to and considered by the Council, which form the basis of the scheme that is before me.
3. No concerns have been raised by Council in relation to proposed detached leisure building and from the evidence before me I see no reason to disagree. I have therefore not referred to the proposed detached leisure building in my reasoning below.

Main Issue

4. In the context of the above, the main issue is the effect of the proposed boundary fencing on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached bungalow situated at the corner of the junction between Station Road and Greenacre Park. The other properties on this part of Greenacre Park comprise semi-detached 1.5 storey dwellings. These dwellings have front boundary treatments that consist primarily of short fencing, hedges, or walls. The appeal property fronts onto Greenacre Park with a significant portion of the proposed boundary fencing also facing in this direction. On the other side of the appeal property is another bungalow which has front and side boundary fencing of a height similar to that of the proposal.

6. The proposed boundary fencing is much higher than the other fencing nearby which also fronts onto Greenacre Park. Consequently, I find that it represents a discordant addition to the street scene thereby having a significant adverse visual impact in this regard.
7. I note that other properties in the wider area, particularly some of those fronting Station Road have fencing similar to the proposal. However, this fencing is not as high as the proposal is meaning that their visual impact would be mitigated somewhat.
8. I also note that the adjacent property, no. 4 Station Road, also has fencing of a similar height to the proposal. However, this fencing has a different design so that it is not completely opaque, and it has a curved pattern at the top, meaning that it has a lesser visual impact than the proposal does. Furthermore, this fencing does not front onto Greenacre Park like the proposal does.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal causes material harm to the character and appearance of the area in conflict with the relevant requirements of Policy ENV1 of the East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document. For similar reasons it would also conflict with paragraphs 130 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework and policies C1 and I1 of the National Design Guide.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has stated that the proposed boundary fencing is needed to protect appeal property from criminals. However, no substantive evidence has been submitted to support this. As a result, this matter is not of sufficient weight to outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Coyne

INSPECTOR