
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2026 by L Clark MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/D/25/3375944

Bruchberg, High Eggborough Lane, High Eggborough DN14 0PS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Stuart Masefield against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZG2024/0773/HPA.
 - The development proposed is a retrospective application for a new fence.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure and Main Issue

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal. The main issue in regard to which is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

3. The appeal site is within a residential area. Properties around the site and leading further into High Eggborough Lane are generally set back from the roadside with mature and leafy front boundaries that lend a high quality verdant feel to the street scene. The property sits on a curve in the road and is visible when entering High Eggborough Lane. The fencing panels are close boarded and combined with their height, create a substantial block along the entire frontage of the property that unacceptably erodes the areas more natural green qualities. The dark colour of the fencing creates a more industrial appearance that is a stark and unacceptable contrast to the surrounding hedges and trees.
4. The development therefore causes harm to the character and appearance of the area and is contrary to Policies ENV1 of the Selby District Local Plan 2005 and SP19 of the Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 which are concerned with development having regard to the context of its surroundings amongst other things.
5. Whilst I appreciate the scheme provides extra privacy, security and helps with keeping dogs, I am not convinced it is the sole way of doing such on the strength of what I have seen. Moreover, I have not been provided with any evidence for the need for increased security at the property. I would consequently afford these matters limited weight.
6. Given the height of the fencing, any hedge planting would not immediately provide a sufficient cover to satisfactorily alleviate the harm that I have identified, because it

would take some considerable time to properly establish. Furthermore, there is limited space between the back edge of the highway and the fence which casts doubt over whether there would be room to facilitate the height and depth of the planting that is proposed or required. A lack of objection from the highways authority or neighbouring occupiers is a neutral matter and would not be able to weigh against the harm I have found.

Conclusion and Recommendation

7. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme conflicts with the development plan and material considerations do not indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Clark

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

8. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR