

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2017

by Helen Hockenhull BA(Hons) B.PI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 20 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/N2739/D/16/3162596

Faraway House, Angel House Farm, Station Road, Wistow, Selby YO8 3RW

- 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 John O'Hara against the decision of Selby District Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/0761/HPA, dated 19 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension and two single storey rear extensions to accommodate enlarged family room, ground floor self-contained annex and two first floor bedrooms with bathrooms.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property known as Faraway, forms a two storey detached house in an isolated location in the open countryside. Angel House Farm lies to the east of the dwelling and shares the same access from Station Road. The dwelling is set back from the road and is screened by existing mature hedgerows to the southern and western boundaries.
 4. Policy SP2 (c) of the Selby District Core Strategy 2013 (CS) allows extensions to existing properties in the countryside and Policies SP19 and ENV1 promote high quality design having regard to local character, identity and context. Saved Policy H14 of the Selby District Local Plan 2005 concerns extensions to dwellings in the countryside and requires amongst other things that a proposal should be appropriate to its setting and not visually intrusive in the landscape, that it would not result in a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original dwelling and would not dominate it visually.
 5. The appellant has questioned the weight to be given to Saved Policy H14 as he believes it is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). I acknowledge that the Framework only makes reference to 'disproportionate additions' in terms of extensions to dwellings in the Green Belt. However the purpose of Saved Policy H14 is to safeguard the countryside from visually dominant development and to achieve good design. In this
-

- regard I consider the Policy is broadly consistent with the Framework, in particular Section 7 which requires high quality design responding to local character and therefore significant weight should be given to it.
6. The appeal scheme proposes a two storey side extension on the site of an existing flat roof double garage together with two single storey rear extensions. I am advised by the Council that the original dwelling has been extended with first floor/rear/side extensions and a two storey side extension. These additions result in a 53% increase in the volume of the original house. The extensions now proposed as part of this appeal, together with the previous extensions, would result in an increase in the volume of the original dwelling by 183%.
 7. It is clear from the above that the appeal would result in a significant addition to the property. Together with the previous extensions, the cumulative volume of additional built form would far exceed that of the original dwelling. The appeal proposal would form a disproportionate addition to the property. In design terms, the two storey side extension in particular, would visually dominate the style and form of the existing house and would not appear as a secondary addition appropriate to its scale.
 8. The main view of the property would be from the neighbouring dwelling, Angel House Farm, however it can also be partially viewed looking down the driveway from Station Road. Long distance views of the house can be achieved from Broad Lane to the south across the flat open landscape. The site is bounded by a hedgerow on this southern boundary but this only provides partial screening to the site from this direction. I consider that the proposed extensions, given their scale, would result in a visually prominent dwelling adversely affecting the character of the open countryside.
 9. I appreciate that the annex is required to provide accommodation for a family member with mobility and health issues. I acknowledge that the scheme would provide housing meeting the needs of older people and people with disabilities. This would contribute to the social role of sustainability as outlined in paragraphs 50 and 17 of the Framework. However this benefit would not outweigh the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding countryside.
 10. The appellant has brought my attention to another property located in the countryside at Long Drax called the Woodlands. Planning permission was granted by the Council for a significant rear extension to this dwelling. This followed consideration of the size of a rear extension that could be constructed under permitted development rights without the need for planning permission. The appeal proposal however differs from this example as it proposes a two storey side extension with more modest rear extensions. Furthermore I have not been provided with evidence of the extent of any potential extensions that could be carried out on the appeal property under such rights. I am therefore unable to assess any fall-back position should one exist.
 11. Bringing the above points together, I consider that the appeal proposal would result in a dominant and disproportionate addition to the host dwelling and cause harm to the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding countryside area. I therefore consider that the proposal would conflict with Saved Policies ENV1 and H14 of the Selby District Local Plan and Policies SP2(c) and SP19 of the Selby District Core Strategy. These policies

aim to achieve high quality design and safeguard the character of the countryside.

Other matters

12. The appellant had made me aware that he received favourable pre application advice from the Council before proceeding with a planning application for this proposal. The Council however gave no feedback during the application process so that amendments to make the scheme more acceptable could not be discussed. The appellant has suggested that the Council has acted contrary to the advice in paragraph 187 of the Framework that local planning authorities should look for solutions rather than problems and should seek to approve sustainable development where possible. This does not form a matter upon which I am required to comment further.
13. I have noted the lack of objection from the Parish Council and the occupant of the neighbouring dwelling. However this does not alter my overall conclusions in this case.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I dismiss this appeal.

Helen Hockenhull

INSPECTOR