



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 21 April 2026

by **A Berry MTCP (Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 June 2026

Appeal B Ref: APP/U2750/W/25/3364313

Land adjacent to Station Road, Hensall

- 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 E Stringer of E&H Stringer Farms against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZG2024/0427/FUL.
 - The development is described as: The erection of access pillars and gates (retrospective).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I am aware of an enforcement appeal¹ for the site for the same development as this appeal, and an appeal² against the Council's refusal to grant planning permission for the change of use of the building and land from agricultural to storage. These appeals are the subject of separate decisions.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on: (a) the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and (b) flood risk.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The development consists of two brick pillars with a light on top of each. In-between the pillars are two solid black/dark grey gates. The elevation drawing³ shows the height of the pillars as 1.8m with the gates marginally lower. However, it was clear from my site visit that the pillars exceeded this height. The use of the term "retrospective" to describe the development implies that permission is sought to retain the gates/pillars as constructed. I have therefore, assessed the development on this basis.
5. The gates/pillars are in the northeastern corner of a field, positioned between Station Road and a Public Footpath. Station Road and the Public Footpath are predominantly bounded by hedges. The surrounding area is largely open fields. Dwellings are located on the opposite side of the road however, they are highly

¹ Appeal Ref APP/U2750/W/25/3364309

² Appeal Ref APP/U2750/W/25/3364310

³ Drawing Number ES003 dated 04/03/2024

concealed due to their set back and height, and the height of the hedgerows. There is a large building, agricultural in appearance, within the field. Consequently, the surrounding area has a rural character and appearance.

6. In contrast, the gates/pillars are domestic in appearance and are imposing due to their height, materials and solid design. I recognise they are not visible when travelling in a northerly direction along Station Road due to the roadside hedge's height. However, they are prominent in views when travelling in a southerly direction. Consequently, they appear incongruous in the rural landscape.
7. A property on the opposite side of the road has solid wooden gates, brick pillars and close boarded fencing to its entrance. However, they are lower in height, set back from Station Road and are flanked on either side of the entrance by a hedge. Consequently, they are not highly visible or comparable to the development.
8. Even if I considered the gates/pillars shown in the elevation drawing rather than as built, the lower height and the omission of the lights would not significantly alter their bulk and prominence, and they would still be domestic in appearance. Consequently, they would not overcome the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
9. The appellant asserts that the gates/pillars replaced an existing gate and their siting approximately 3m further into the site has reduced their visual impact. However, limited evidence has been provided regarding the height, design or materials of the former gate or its precise siting for a comparison to be made.
10. For these reasons, the gates/pillars have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. They conflict with Policy SP19 of the Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan, adopted 2013 and Policies SG1 and ENV1 of the Selby District Local Plan Part 1 - General Policies, adopted 2005 that, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development achieves high quality design and has regard to local character, identity and context of its surroundings including the open countryside.

Flood Risk

11. The gates/pillars are within Flood Zones 2 and 3. A site specific Flood Risk Assessment ("FRA") has been submitted. However, it fails to consider whether the solid pillars/gates would increase flood risk elsewhere. Consequently, I have insufficient information before me to assess the effect of the gates/pillars on flood risk. The development therefore conflicts with the NPPF in this regard.

Other Matters

12. The appellant asserts that the gates/pillars are required to improve access and security. I have not been provided with evidence that the site has experienced problems with trespassers or theft; that the previous access was substandard; or that other less harmful measures could not afford the same benefits.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

A Berry

INSPECTOR