



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 March 2023

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/22/3311208

Ganymede, 25 Ebor Manor, Keyingham, East Riding of Yorkshire HU12 9SN

- 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 Michael Taylor against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02748/PLF, dated 15 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a boundary wall with iron infills to front and side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the boundary wall on the character and appearance of the area around Ebor Manor.

Reasons

3. No 25 is a detached house situated within a small residential estate along Ebor Manor. Ebor Manor is a complex cul-de-sac with two arms extending out from the end of the main spine of the road, which leads off Church Lane. The appeal property is located at the end of the main spine at the point where it splits into the north and south arms. The boundary wall and infill railings are in place such that the planning application has the nature of a retrospective proposal.
4. The boundary treatment extends across the southern part of the front of the property and also to the side of the front garden, between Nos 25 and 24. It comprises a number of brick pillars with iron railings between. The boundary wall is around 1.8 metres in height and the railings are around 1.6 metres in height. They are set back from the road boundary by around 1.5 metres. There is a hard-surfaced area in front of the boundary wall and railings which, at the time of my visit, contained 3 planters across the frontage.
5. Policy ENV1 of the Council's Local Plan Strategy Document (LP) indicates that development will be supported where it achieves a high quality of design that contributes to a sense of place. This will be accomplished by, amongst other things, having regard to the specific characteristics of the site's wider context and the character of the surrounding area.

6. The Council contends that the siting, scale and height of the boundary wall and railings, together with the materials used, causes harm to the character and appearance of the site and streetscene. It gives the plot a 'fortress-like' appearance, enclosing this part of the streetscene with a hard edge which creates a harsh and comparatively sterile environment. The development fails to respect the context, character and appearance of the area or to add to its overall quality, and does it does not make any positive contribution to the distinctiveness of the streetscene and its relatively open nature. The addition of a tall, enclosing structure leads to the loss of the low and open frontages which play a key role in the character of the area.
7. The appellant contends that the boundary treatment has been designed to enhance the street scene of Ebor Manor, providing a more open feeling to the area. The boundary treatment does not look out of context within the wider area and causes no visual harm to the character of existing properties. Moreover, the design and layout of the new boundary treatment was also considered so as to reduce its visual impact on the street scene and provide greater visibility when entering and exiting the driveway of No 25. Finally, the appellant notes that the appeal property directly faces the side gardens and driveways of the 2 houses opposite. One is enclosed by a high privet hedge, and the other, No 42, is enclosed by brick piers, a low wall, and timber panels.
8. Ebor Manor is a small residential estate consisting of a mix of detached houses and bungalows of varying design, each with largely open-plan front gardens and associated driveways. The road itself is relatively narrow and many of the houses have gardens and driveways extending to the edge of the highway itself. The prevailing character of the estate is one of openness at the fronts of the properties. Some of the properties have hedges to the front boundary and there is a limited amount of other shrubs/small trees evident.
9. The appellant acknowledges that the design of the front boundary treatment is unique to Ebor Manor, and I consider that, by virtue of its height and materials, it is harmful to the general open character and appearance of the estate. In addition, the siting of the appeal property at the head of the spine road means that it is a relatively prominent position, and therefore has a significant visual impact within the area.
10. I acknowledge that No 42 has a small brick wall and fence to its side boundary, but in this case the boundary treatment provides a degree of privacy to the rear garden of the property. This is not the case with the appeal property, which would appear to be the only dwelling in the area with a hard boundary treatment to the front. Similarly, the hedge at No 43 opposite, along with the boundary fence treatment at No 18 on the opposite corner plot, relate to the enclosure of private rear garden areas. Nos 42, 43 and 18 all occupy corner-type plots and the treatment of the enclosure of private amenity areas at these properties cannot be considered as precedent for the front boundary at No 25.
11. In conclusion, I find that the boundary wall and railings at No 25 are harmful to character and appearance of the area around Ebor Manor, and conflict with Policy ENV1 of the LP. Accordingly, I dismiss this appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR