



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 September 2019 by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

Decision by A U Ghafoor BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/W/19/3231434

Westcroft Farm, Long Street, Rudston YO25 4UH

- 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 Phil Slasor against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref: 19/00203/PLF, dated 18 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as "resubmission of proposed 2 bedroom bungalow to land south of Westcroft Farm, Rudston YO25 4UH".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the street scene and the Yorkshire Wolds Important Landscape Area (YWILA) and, linked to that, whether the site would be suitable for residential development.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Rudston is identified in the East Riding Local Plan 2012-2029 Strategy Document (2016) (ERLP) as a settlement where development should be focused where it would help maintain the vibrancy of the village. Part B of Policy S4 notes that single dwellings that do not detract from the character and appearance of the village could be supported within the development limits. As such, the principle of a single dwelling, as proposed as part of this appeal, would reflect the Councils approach to the distribution of development.
5. The settlement boundary for Rudston is set out on Policy Map, Inset 129. The appellant is of the view that the site is entirely within the settlement boundary whilst the Council disagree. It is agreed by both parties that the site is, in part at least, within the settlement boundary, which appears to intersect between two dwellings on the opposite side of the road and then across land within the appellants ownership. However, there are no physical features on site to indicate where the boundary falls.

6. The boundary on the plan, shown at the scale of Inset 129, does not necessarily relate exactly with what is on the ground and especially where the settlement boundary does not clearly relate to on site features, this further muddies the water. Consequently, the existing dwelling, if not the entirety of the appeal site, falls within the settlement boundary. In principle the site would be suitable for residential development of the kind proposed so long as the proposal would not detract from the character and appearance of the village.
7. There is no dominant architectural character along this section of the street and there are a mix of two storey and single storey dwellings in the street scene. The choice of materials would match the other dwellings that have recently been constructed adjacent to the site. There is ribbon development along this end of Long Street and the dwellings typically have large front and rear gardens that are spaciouly laid out and have wide facades that front the street. The proposed dwelling has been designed to fit within the settlement boundary, but this results in a narrow built-form and a dwelling that would sit within a very slim plot. The resultant development would appear contrived because of the dwelling's overall design and layout. It would have narrow gable end fronting the road, which is uncommon in the street scene and there would be a comparatively small gap between Westcroft Farm and the proposed dwelling. This would create a cramped form of built development that would appear out-of-keeping with the character of the settlement.
8. The site is in a transitional location between the countryside and the approach to the village. The open undeveloped land associated with Westcroft Farm visually softens the approach to the village and contributes to the open and scenic gateway. Whilst the site is currently being used for storage as part of the ongoing construction work, nevertheless it positively contributes to the character and appearance of the street scene and the YWILA.
9. The village of Rudston is split into two development areas which both have separate development boundaries. Westcroft Farm is currently the southern edge of the built form between the two areas of Rudston. The two areas are partitioned by a large open area of undeveloped land which is bounded by the footpath along the Gypsy Race river which borders its northern and eastern boundary. This land, including Rudston itself, is within the YWILA. The land between the two parts of Rudston is undeveloped and this openness contributes to its rural character and is highly sensitive to development.
10. The site is visible from various locations along Gypsy Race and further afield. The land to the north of the site has been extensively redeveloped and several new dwellings have been built or are currently under construction. Despite this, Westcroft Farm has visually remained the edge of the built development on this side of Long Street.
11. A garage connected to Westcroft Farm was approved on land to the rear of the site, which would be a similar height to the proposed dwelling¹. However, due to the size of the garage, it would clearly be an outbuilding associated with a larger dwelling whereas the proposed dwelling would be considerably larger, and it would be a separate dwelling within a residential plot. Additionally, the approved garage maintained the building line and did not extend much beyond the side wall of Westcroft Farm. Whilst surrounding residential development can be seen between the two parts of Rudston, developing beyond Westcroft

¹ Council ref: 19/00191/PLF.

Farm would extend the built form of the village into an open area of the YWILA which would harm its special character.

12. While the scale and kind of residential development proposed would be acceptable, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the street scene due to the dwelling's orientation, siting, design and external appearance. The proposal would visually harm the special character and appearance of the locally important landscape. Accordingly, the development would conflict with ERLP Policies S4, A2, ENV1 and ENV2.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Sibley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I too agree and conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A U Ghafoor

INSPECTOR