



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2025

by **A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/25/3374507

3 Skipsea Road, Beeford, Driffield YO25 8AL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Sam Artley against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01339/PLF.
 - The application is for 1.8m high fence to front boundary to replace 2m plus high privet hedge (retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is the front garden of a detached house that was, at the time of my site visit, undergoing building work for a sizeable extension. The property sits on the approach and the edge of the village of Beeford along a small road that runs in the direction of Skipsea. The village of Beeford is bisected by the main Beverley Road that has had the effect of splitting the village into two parts.
4. The area around the appeal site retains its character as a typical rural lane on approach into a village. There are buildings of various types and ages that epitomise this character and Skipsea Road runs alongside the Beeford Beck which flows within a cutting adjacent to this site.
5. The majority of boundary treatments near to the site appeared to be natural hedges or low walls, often with an area of grass verge running alongside the road. Apparently, there was a high privet hedge boundary treatment around this site prior to it being grubbed out in early 2025. The replacement boundary treatment for the hedge is an extent of horizontal timber fencing supported on concrete posts that extends around 42m along the road frontage. The reason for the hedge is apparently for increased security.
6. In assessing this appeal, I am aware of the Council's Policy ENV1 of the East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document that reflects the National Planning Policy Framework in its desire for high quality design and this includes landscaping. This is reflected in the East Riding Design Code (ERDC) that states that boundary

treatments to the fronts of properties should not exceed 1.2m in height. As such the scheme was recognised as being non compliant with the ERDC in this regard at time of application.

7. The justification for the fence is to ensure security and privacy and the height was determined due to the height of the previous hedge here. However, the hedge was a quintessentially rural feature that would have helped soften the approach into the village and presumably also allowed habitat for wildlife. Its removal has led to a much more stark and modern aesthetic that is out of scale and out of character with the surroundings. Added to this the fact that the fence is placed along a main approach into the village and its appearance is much more harmful.
8. Despite this, the Appellant's suggestion, within their appeal statement, is that laurel type hedging could be planted along the verge on the outside of the fence thereby mitigating its appearance somewhat. Whilst I consider that some such mitigation could occur eventually through this course of action, it may well take some years for the fence to be fully obscured. More pertinent however is the fact that, were I to condition such an approval in this manner, I would have no ability to determine whether the effect of a hedge this close to the highway would impede the needs of highway safety.
9. As such, whilst I concede that the planting of hedging here could mitigate the harmful appearance of this fence, at least in the longer term, I am unable to be confident that there would be no other adverse effects from doing so. As such I am unable to allow the appeal on such a conditional basis.
10. Ultimately, there would likely be ways to enable this proposal to meet the Council's objectives and to better protect the character of the area however, as the scheme stands, it would fail to meet the Policy requirements of Local Plan Policy ENV1 or the ERDC itself. As such, this appeal must fail in this instance.

Conclusion

11. The proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and, for the reasons given above, whilst taking into account all other matters raised, I must dismiss this appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR