



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2017

by Caroline Mulloy BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 8th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/17/3180566

5 Beechwood Close, Fangoss, York, East Yorkshire YO41 5SJ

- 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 D V Greaves against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref DC/17/01486/PLF/WESTWW, dated 23 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 21 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is single storey porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a converted agricultural outbuilding which was granted planning permission¹ for residential development including the erection of 3 new dwellings, the conversion of outbuildings to 2 dwellings and the erection of a double garage to existing dwellings. A condition is imposed on the original permission which has the effect of removing permitted development rights from the two barn conversions.
4. The building is single storey constructed in brick with a red pantile roof. It has only one door on the rear elevation and a single door and 6 windows on the front elevation. Overall, the building has a very simple appearance, reflective of its former use.
5. The surrounding development includes the former farm house which is two storey and grander in appearance. The new build development consists of two-storey houses which like the appeal property are constructed of brick and red pantile but have a more formal, domestic appearance.
6. It is proposed to erect a single storey porch extension with a gable feature together with associated ramp to the main front elevation which would be constructed in reclaimed original imperial facing brick and pantiles to match the host property. The painted softwood window and stable style door would also reflect the character of the host property.

¹ Planning application reference 15/00440/PLF

7. Nonetheless, the proposed porch and ramp would complicate the very simple front elevation of the existing building and introduce a domestic, formal element which is not a characteristic feature of the building's former use. It would, therefore, detract from the agricultural character of the host property, thus undermining its architectural legibility. Whilst I noted small, open porches on some of the houses within the development, these are situated on the new houses which have a more domestic character. The proposal would, therefore, be an incongruous addition which would harm the character and appearance of the host property.
8. Furthermore, it would be highly visible from the access road and to residents of surrounding properties and would, therefore, harm the character and appearance of the area.
9. Attention is drawn to the 4 bedroom property to the rear which the appellant considers dominates and overshadows the appeal property. However, I noted on my site visit that the apex of the dwelling merely peaks over the roof of the appeal property and does not, therefore, appear dominant. Whilst the proposal may distract the eye from the apex of the roof, this would be due to the incongruous nature of the porch. The presence of the dwelling behind does not, therefore, justify the harm which I have identified.
10. Attention is drawn to two porches situated on the Bungalow and Anvil House respectively at Corner House. No details of these cases are provided and so I cannot be certain that they benefit from planning permission or that if they do that they were determined within the same development plan context. I cannot, therefore, be certain that they are directly comparable to the appeal proposal which limits the weight which can be attached to them in my Decision. Furthermore, I noted that in the case of Anvil House the porch was significantly smaller than the appeal proposal. In any event, their presence does not justify the harm which I have identified.
11. The appellant considers that the proposal would provide protection for an area of damp at the front door. However, I consider that the issue of damp could be addressed by other means. Although the proposal may have some benefits for the occupier, including improved living accommodation, the benefits would not outweigh the significant harm which I have identified.
12. For the reasons stated, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would, therefore, be contrary to Policy ENV1 of the East Riding Local Plan (2016) Strategy Document which seeks to ensure that development proposals contribute to safeguarding and respecting the diverse character and appearance of the area through their design, layout construction and use.
13. Conflict also arises with paragraphs 56-58 and 61 of the National Planning Policy Framework which state that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and that it is important to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design.

Conclusion

14. For the reason stated and taking all other considerations into account the appeal should be dismissed.

Caroline Mulloy

Inspector