



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 September 2019

by Graeme Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/19/3232268

Chapel Cottage, Easington Road, Kilnsea, East Riding of Yorkshire HU12 0UB

- 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 Andrews against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00585/PLF, dated 18 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of an extension to the side of a dwelling with a dormer to the rear following the demolition of existing flat roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Chapel Cottage is a modest detached bungalow which has been added to at various points in its history with lean-to and flat roofed extensions on both sides and to the rear. Although typical of the small detached cottages, bungalows and cabins that are scattered along Spurn Head, there is no particular uniformity of design in houses situated along Easington Road.
4. Easington Road is a long straight stretch of road which runs close to the western side of Spurn Head, with the Humber estuary to the rear of the appeal site. Although Chapel Cottage differs from the prevailing form of development along Easington Road in that it is located close to the highway edge behind only a narrow grassed verge, the dense windswept hedgerows on either side prevent longer views of the existing building until almost directly in front of it.
5. The proposal would add significantly to the existing building; not in terms of footprint area, which would only modestly exceed that of the existing mix of extensions, but instead in terms of scale, bulk and massing. Indeed, in some respects the side extension's gable elevation and dormer window cheek would appear as a somewhat ungainly addition to the side of the host building. Although longer views towards the extended property would be partially screened by the dense roadside hedges, and thus largely only noticeable from directly head on, the proposal would nonetheless considerably alter the modest scale and character of the host building.

6. Thus, the eaves and ridge lines of the extension would run incongruously above those of the existing building when viewed from the front, significantly and harmfully altering the proportions and character of the host building. In closer oblique views of the side elevation, the substantial depth of the dormer extension's cheek would also be evident, at odds with the modest scale and character of Chapel Cottage.
7. However, the dense hedgerows to either side of the appeal site would limit longer views from both directions towards Chapel Cottage. The mismatch of eaves and ridge lines would not be widely evident in these views, nor would the substantial dormer 'cheek' on the building's extended side elevation. Indeed, where longer views are possible from the north, the incorporation of an external chimney stack on the gable elevation and the dormer's inset from the gable would provide some welcome relief and articulation on this elevation.
8. Notwithstanding these positive aspects however, it would nonetheless result in a form of extension that would fail to achieve the high quality of design, contribution to an area's sense of place or respect the character or appearance of the area that East Riding Local Plan (ERLP) policy ENV1(A)(1) and (B)(3) seek. Nor would the proposed form of the extension, particularly in its relationship with the host building's front elevation and roof lines, be of an appropriate scale, massing or height to that of Chapel Cottage. Furthermore, the prominent position of Chapel Cottage close to the highway edge would emphasise the ungainly proportions of the extension, even if longer views of it would be mitigated somewhat by the dense roadside hedgerows on either side.
9. For these reasons, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building, contrary to ERLP policy ENV1. However, those harmful impacts would only be felt locally in respect of the proposal's relationship with the host property and the area immediately around it. Which means the proposal is contrary to ERLP policy ENV1. However, for the mitigating reasons also highlighted above, I do not consider that the proposal would cause harm to the character, appearance or sensitivity of the wider Spurn Heritage Coast. There would be no conflict with ERLP policies ENV2 or A5 insofar as they relate to the landscape character and conservation aims of the Spurn Heritage Coast.
10. I accept that there would be some positive aspects of the extension's design, which I have highlighted above. I accept too, that the extension would rationalise into one extension the hotchpotch of additions and extensions that have been added to Chapel Cottage over time. These factors do not, however, outweigh harm to the character and appearance of the host property that I have highlighted above.

Other Matters

11. I have noted that the proposed first floor element of the extension would provide a degree of flood resilience and place of refuge for the appellant in the event of flooding. Given the vulnerable location of the appeal site in relation to the Humber estuary, the North Sea and Spurn Head I can understand the appellant's reasons for incorporating a first floor within the proposal. However, whilst I give modest weight to this matter, it is not sufficient to justify a proposal that would fail to secure high quality design or to override the harm to character and appearance that I have identified above.

12. My attention was also drawn to the presence of the Spurn Heritage Coast visitor centre, a short distance away from the appeal site, and to a nearby hotel building, both of which, the appellant states, are far more visible and dominant than the proposed extension. I do not however have the full details of those proposals before or the development plan context in which they were considered, but they do not appear to be directly comparable to an extension to a residential property. I have, in any event, determined the appeal before me on its merits and the available evidence.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Graeme Robbie

INSPECTOR