

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 March 2017

by L Fleming BSc (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 29 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/16/3167788

Fair View Farm House, Main Street, Reedness, Goole, East Riding of Yorks DN14 8HQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Trevor Walker against East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 16/03317/PLF, is dated 30 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of domestic curtilage building ancillary to main dwellinghouse following demolition of existing curtilage buildings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed and planning permission is refused.

Procedural Matters and Main Issue

2. The application was made to the Council as a householder application for planning permission for works or extensions to a dwelling. However, it is contested whether the appeal site is in residential use and thus it is the Council's view that a full application was required.
3. The Council resolved that had it been in a position to determine the application, it would have refused planning permission for reasons relating to (1) the planning application should have been a full application, (2) the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and (3) the effect of the proposal on flood risk linked to the Council's view on the current use of the appeal site.
4. On the basis of the evidence before me I am unable to make a determination on the existing use of the appeal site. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons I have not considered the existing use of the appeal site or matters relating to flood risk any further. Thus, the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. Fair View Farmhouse is a detached two storey dwelling which sits directly alongside and in line with a terrace of four two storey dwellings positioned relatively close to Main Street. On the opposite side of Main Street is a narrow footway adjacent to a tall concrete flood defence wall with railings on top. These features and the overall relatively narrow road give the area an enclosed and compact character and appearance.
-

6. The proposal would involve the demolition of modest outbuildings and the erection of a one and half storey building positioned close to Main Street. I acknowledge the existing buildings on the site are in relatively poor condition and the proposed development would reduce views into the appeal site and beyond. However, the existing outbuildings provide a degree of spacious relief in the otherwise compact street scene.
7. The proposed building would be wide and noticeably taller than the buildings it would replace. Thus, the proposal would introduce a significant bulk of development close to the road along a significant part of the road frontage. This would enclose this section of the road and exacerbate the compact and enclosed character of the area which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
8. For these reasons, the proposal would conflict with Policy ENV1 of the East Riding Local Plan 2012 – 2029 Strategy Document (2016) which seeks to ensure new development respects the diverse character and appearance of an area and contributes to a sense of place.

Other Matters

9. I acknowledge the appellant's desire for additional accommodation to comfortably live alongside relatives and also maintain an involvement in the family business and I note the benefits of such in terms of managing the effects of old age. I have also noted the support of the Parish Council and that there are no objections to the proposed development from nearby residents. I have also noted that the position of the proposed building has been influenced by the site levels and efforts to mitigate flood risk. However, these matters or any others raised do not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development would not accord with the development plan and therefore having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed and planning permission is refused.

L Fleming

INSPECTOR