The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 August 2017

by Helen Hockenhull BA(Hons) B.Pl MRTPI

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

Decision date: 05 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/W/17/3176535
Wayside Cottage, Station Road, Ottringham, Hull HU12 0BJ

- 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 and Mrs Shaw against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
- The application Ref DC/16/04133/PLF/EASTSE, dated 7 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 March 2017.
- The development proposed is a replacement dwelling following demolition of existing outbuildings.

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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in the open countryside to the north of Ottringham. The existing dwelling on the site forms a two storey cottage constructed in traditional brick materials with a single storey integral garage and a separate single storey outbuilding. The property is accessed from a private single track road and occupies a generous plot with an existing hawthorn hedge to the eastern and northern boundaries. I am advised that the cottage has a usable floor area of around 158 square metres and is 7.3 metres high to the ridge.

4. The appeal proposes the demolition of the existing house and its replacement with a three storey double fronted dwelling with a single storey sun room/atrium to the side. The property would have 4 bedrooms, 2 of which would be provided in the roof space. The proposal would have a useable floor area of approximately 260 square metres, approximately 65 % greater than that of the existing cottage and a height of approximately 9.3 metres.

5. Policy S4 of the East Riding Local Plan 2012-2029 (ERLP) permits replacement dwellings in the countryside where their design and character reflects the surrounding area. The supporting text in paragraph 4.41 states that the increase in the usable floor area of the original building that would be permitted would normally be no more than 50%. Whilst the appeal proposal would exceed this policy requirement, the Council accepts that in some cases

a larger dwelling may be acceptable providing it is of an appropriate design and scale for the site and the rural location.

6. The appellant has provided evidence that if the existing dwelling were to be extended under permitted development rights then the resultant floor area would be greater than that proposed. I have no indication that this factor was considered by the Council. Nevertheless as I have stated above the Council accepts that a larger dwelling could be appropriate subject to consideration of the design and scale.

7. The appeal site is located in an area with a rural and agricultural character. The existing house is simply designed built in traditional materials and does not appear overly prominent in the landscape. The appellant has brought my attention to the variety of design and materials of dwellings close to the appeal site and slightly further afield on Station Road. I observed these on my site visit. The majority of these dwellings are similarly located in large plots and many form double fronted dwellings. There is a mix of two storey detached and semi-detached properties as well as bungalows. I also noted that some properties had been extended creating larger footprints.

8. Having regard to the size of the appeal site, I consider that a house with a larger floor area would in principle be acceptable and would not be out of character with other dwellings in the locality. However whilst I acknowledge the variety of design of nearby dwellings, I am not aware of any other two storey dwellings with dormers in the roof space, creating three floors of accommodation. Whilst there are other properties with dormers, these are bungalows or garage extensions and provide accommodation at first floor only. The proposed dwelling would be around 9.3 metres in height. This would be significantly higher than the majority of the properties in the surrounding area. I consider that as a result, the proposed dwelling would be out of character in this rural area.

9. The Council have argued that the appeal scheme is very elaborate and urban in appearance and would be more akin to a town location. The design of the proposal lacks the simplicity and rural character of the existing cottage on the site. I acknowledge that this simple design need not necessarily be replicated in the replacement dwelling. However bearing in mind the variety of design in the area, I consider that the scheme proposed, due to its formality and detailing, would not be in keeping with the existing dwellings in the area.

10. The appeal proposal would be visible from Station Road. Whilst there are existing trees to the southern and eastern boundary of the site, these would provide only partial screening to the replacement dwelling. The property would be seen in the wider area and due to its height and design would result in harm to the character and appearance of the locality.

11. The appellant has brought my attention to a property at Croft Garth on Station Road where a replacement dwelling is under construction. The replacement house would have a floor area more than double the existing and I observed would also be much higher than the existing house. My attention has been brought to the fact that the Council considered this large dwelling to be in keeping with the style and size of surrounding properties along Station Road and that it would therefore integrate into its surroundings. I have not

been provided with drawings of the existing and the proposed dwelling on this site in order to make a detailed comparison, though I was able to view the site on my visit. In any event, each proposal should be considered on its individual merits and having regard to it context.

12. I have noted the support for the proposal from the occupants of neighbouring dwellings and the lack of objection from the Parish Council. However whilst I consider that a replacement dwelling with a footprint larger than that of the existing house would be appropriate, I consider that the height and design of the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. The appeal scheme would therefore conflict with Policies S4 and ENV1 of the ERLP which aim to and integrate high quality design having regard to the sites wider context and the intrinsic character of the surrounding area. These policies are consistent with paragraph 17 and Section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to secure high quality design and recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

Conclusion

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

Helen Hockenhull

INSPECTOR