



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2023

by K Mansell BA (Hons) MPhil TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 January 2024.

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/23/3329798

**Roban House, 32 Humber Road, North Ferriby, East Riding of Yorkshire
HU14 3DW**

- 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 Steve Dixon against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01685/PLF, dated 6 June 2023, was refused by notice dated 1 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is erection of a detached garage and store/workshop and side boundary fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. On 20 December 2023, the Government published an updated revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). In relation to the main issue in this appeal, Government policy has not materially changed, other than a modification to relevant paragraph numbers. For this reason, I have not sought the parties' comments upon it but neither party has been prejudiced by my having regard to it.

Main Issue

3. The Council has raised no concerns in respect of the side boundary fence. From the submitted evidence, I see no reason to disagree with that assessment. Therefore, the matter in dispute relates solely to the proposed garage and store/workshop. For this reason, the main issue is:
 - The effect of the detached garage and store/workshop on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Beyond its junction with Ings Lane, Humber Road is principally characterised by substantial detached dwellings with typically wide frontages set within generous plots. Whilst there is not a wholly consistent building line along the street, the houses are mainly set well back from the road behind mature front gardens and driveways with a further garden to the rear. The properties are typically delineated by hedgerows to their front boundaries. Combined with the grass verge running adjacent to each side of the highway, and an open vista to the River Humber at the southern end of the main street, the road has an open and spacious character.

5. The appeal property is a distinctive two-storey dwelling situated at the junction of the main stretch of Humber Road to its front boundary and the cul-de-sac of the same name serving Nos 22-30 Humber Road along its northern side. Architecturally, the house appears quite unique within the street. Individual features include cream painted brickwork, decorative flared eaves, ornate white window mouldings and a five-sided flat roofed bay window to the front elevation.
6. The appeal proposal would introduce a large, detached garage/store/workshop over part of the front lawn. Despite the use of detailing to reflect the appearance of the main house, including a decorative fascia, matching materials, quoin stones and dummy recessed windows, as a result of its size, scale and position within the front garden, it would nonetheless appear dominant within the street scene. Being forward of the principal elevation of the house, it would be prominent when viewed from both the main stretch of Humber Road and in views across the front garden from the cul-de-sac. It would interrupt the visibility and legibility of the main façade of the house from the highway to the detriment of the wider street scene.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to the neighbouring dwelling at 34 Humber Road, where the garage is forward of the main house, and an unspecified property at the end of the street, where the garage sits adjacent to the road, in line with the house. However, from my observations on site, the garage to No 34 is generously set back from the road and its front garden remains undeveloped and landscaped. I also saw that the properties within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site did not include large structures within their front gardens. Consequently, the position, scale and massing of the appeal proposal would appear at odds with the prevailing character of these open frontages, and it would therefore be visually discordant.
8. I recognise that the appellant intends to restore the landscaping within the front garden to its original mature state, and retain the boundary hedges up to a height of approximately 2 metres. However, the garage/store/workshop would have a ridge height of just over 5.5 metres. Consequently, even though the ground level of the front garden to No 32 is set modestly below the road, it would still be clearly visible from Humber Road and the cul-de-sac. Whilst a private view, such as that from a window, is not a planning matter, the garage/store/workshop would thus be evident from public vantage points. Furthermore, even if it were somewhat obscured from neighbouring properties by mature trees and planting, it would nonetheless introduce built development between the house and the road of a scale that is not a typical feature of the streetscape, and it would appear incongruous as a result.
9. For these reasons, I conclude that the garage and store/workshop would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy ENV1 of the East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document 2012-2029 (April 2016). This policy seeks to secure high-quality design and to ensure, amongst other matters, that development has regard to the site's wider character and context and is of an appropriate scale and massing. It would further conflict with guidance at paragraph 135 of the revised Framework (formerly paragraph 130 as stated on the Council's decision notice), which promotes the importance of good design, including the need for development to function well and add to the overall quality of the area.

Other Matters

10. I acknowledge that a previous application¹ for a detached garage/workshop to the front with a side boundary fence was refused in April 2023 by members of the Council's Planning Committee, against the recommendation of Officers. I also note that the appellant had engaged with the Council during that application process and made subsequent changes to the scheme leading to a positive recommendation from Officers. However, my role is confined to a consideration of the scheme before me, which I must consider on its individual merits.
11. I appreciate that the appellant would like a garage for storage given the limitations within the house, and that the proposal would provide covered vehicle parking. The scheme would also facilitate the re-design of the driveway to avoid tree roots and the installation of an electric vehicle charging point, although I have nothing before me to indicate that these two elements could not be implemented independent of the garage and store/workshop. However, planning decisions are taken in the public interest and personal circumstances do not, in my view, outweigh the harm to the surrounding character of the area that I have identified previously. Nor does the lack of objections from some of the neighbours justify development that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Mansell

INSPECTOR

¹ 22/02921/PLF