



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 August 2019

by R E Walker BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/19/3230067

Old School Bungalow, Dimlington Road, Easington, East Riding of Yorkshire HU12 0TG

- 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 Broome against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00201/PLF, dated 17 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a dormer to the rear by raising part of the ridge height to allow sufficient internal head room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application which accurately describes the development proposed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a detached single storey building which was previously associated with the former school along the frontage of Dimlington Road. Both buildings have been converted to residential dwellings. The appeal property has a wide gable and low ridge height with a large conservatory at one gable end which is taller than the host building. The appeal property appears as a later addition to the traditional school building. Due to its proportions and materials it has a somewhat functional and simple appearance which contrasts with the architectural interest of the frontage school building.

5. The Council's *Design Guidance for House Extensions: A Guide for Home Owners on How to get Planning Permission to extend your house* (DG) suggests that dormers should not dominate the roof slope which generally means setting the dormer down from the ridge and in from the gables. It also says that dormers are to be set away from the eaves to ensure that they remain subordinate. The proposed dormer would be set in from the gable ends however it would extend as far as the eaves and would raise the ridgeline conflicting with that part of the Council's design guidance.
6. Due to the scale and design, the proposed dormer would have a box like form, giving it a stark and discordant appearance on the roof. Moreover, it would disrupt the architectural simplicity and proportions of the building which would create an unbalanced form. The proposed windows on the dormer would not relate to the ground floor windows either in proportions, design or alignment. The combination of this with the scale and position of the dormer rising from the ground floor brickwork and the increase in height would, in my view, create an incongruous addition to the property.
7. I appreciate that the host building is not a historic school building and has limited architectural interest in comparison with the frontage building. However, it has a simplistic form with a low, wide profile which the proposed dormer would fail to harmonise with. Although the conservatory is taller than the bungalow, this is seen as a separate entity to the host building due to the extent of glazing and hipped roof form and its position on the gable end of the building.
8. The presence of the gas terminal to the north and the position of the two-storey housing to the south along with trees and vegetation bordering the property would reduce the visual presence of the proposal within the wider public realm. From Dimlington Road the proposed dormer would not be seen and only the proposed extended roof slope would be visible. With matching materials proposed on the roof slope, there would be little discernible difference from the existing views of the property from Dimlington Road.
9. The proposed dormer would be visible through the trees and vegetation from Vicars Lane to the north. I understand that this is a private road, however I observed that there remains both vehicular and pedestrian activity along its length. The proposed dormer would also be partially visible from more distant views from Vicars Lane to the east and in private views from the surrounding residential properties. Thus, even though the dormer would not be dominant from wider views, it would, nonetheless, be an undesirable incremental change that would erode the overall character and quality of the area.
10. The appellant argues that, in reaching their decision, the committee members did not undertake a site visit and therefore could not understand the proposal in full. Nevertheless, I have considered the context of the appeal site from my onsite observations and the evidence before me and have determined the appeal on its own merits.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would result in an adverse effect on the character and appearance of both the host property and surrounding area. The proposal would therefore conflict with the design aims of Policy ENV1 of the East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document 2016 and the Council's DG. Policy ENV1 aims to ensure that development safeguards and respects the character of the area through good design and appropriate scale, massing and height.

Policy ENV1 is consistent with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework and can therefore be given substantial weight.

Other Matters

12. I have had regard to other matters raised including the effects on living conditions of the neighbouring property during construction. However, any disturbance would be for a limited period during the course of construction and I am not satisfied those concerns would amount to a reason to withhold planning permission

Conclusion

13. I have taken account of all the other matters raised. However, none changes the balance of these findings and the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Robert Walker

INSPECTOR