The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2020 by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Decision by Anne Jordan BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date:

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/19/3242355
The Hollies, Main Street, Leconfield HU17 7NQ

- 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 Lister against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
- The application Ref 19/02438/PLF, dated 5 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2019.
- The development proposed is erection of outbuilding to rear of garden.

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. It appeared on my site visit that building work had started and the detached garage to the side of the property had been demolished.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposed outbuilding on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The Hollies is a modest, detached bungalow situated within a generous plot. Planning permission was recently granted for a domestic outbuilding and demolition of an existing garage[1]. The amended scheme, which is the subject of this appeal, seeks to increase the width and height of the outbuilding. The approved outbuilding would measure approximately 25.5 metres in length by 7.1m in width with an eaves height of 3-3.3m and ridge height of 4.9-5.5m. The outbuilding now proposed would measure approximately 25.5m in length by 8.3m in width with an eaves height of 3.2-3.5m and ridge height of 6.5-7m.

6. The East Riding of Yorkshire Council Design Guidance for House Extensions (DG) provides guidance for outbuildings. The DG states that it is important that

[1] 17/04290/PLF

outbuildings are sympathetic to the main dwelling in terms of materials, style and proportions. Additionally, two-storey outbuildings are unlikely to be acceptable, unless they are situated in a particularly large garden.

7. There would be a relatively large gap between the host property and the scheme. Nonetheless, the proposed building would clearly be seen in the context of The Hollies, rather than in isolation. The outbuilding would be a very substantial building in its own right, and its scale would be out of keeping with the bungalow due to its massing and ridge height.

8. Properties along this side of Main Street generally have large rear gardens and outbuildings are not prominent. Although the outbuilding would be situated to the rear of the bungalow and set back from Main Street, it would be nonetheless appear as a large 2 storey building which would fill the width of the plot. The proposal would be visible from the highway as a result of its height, size and the siting of The Hollies. Moreover, the scheme would be visible from the public footpath adjacent to the appeal site. The existing hedge to the rear of the outbuilding would only partially screen the development because of its height, and even less so during autumn and winter. Consequently, the proposed scheme would result in an obtrusively large and discordant structure which would appear at odds with the prevailing character of the area.

9. I note that there is planning permission to significantly increase the size of The Hollies[2]. As well as the large garage included within the appeal scheme, the proposed alterations to The Hollies includes a double garage. It is not clear from the evidence provided why the outbuilding needs to be of the size proposed. However, even if the main dwelling were to be enlarged to the extent proposed, taking into account the size of the proposal before me, which would appear as a 2 storey structure spanning the width of the plot, I am not convinced that it would be perceived as an outbuilding, or appear subservient or ancillary to either the existing dwelling or the enlarged host dwelling.

10. The appellant has drawn my attention to the housing allocation associated with the land to the rear of the site and related planning applications[3]. Housing to the rear of the site would inevitably alter the character of the wider area. Nevertheless, as the proposal has been advanced on the basis that the building is an outbuilding, which sits within the wider curtilage of the host building, it must be considered in the context of its relationship with the host property, and this would not be significantly altered by the other development proposed.

11. For those reasons, the proposed outbuilding would have a significant adverse visual effect upon the character and appearance of the host building and the area. Accordingly, the development would not comply with Policy ENV1 of the East Riding Local Plan 2012-2029: Strategy Document (2016), the DG and the National Planning Policy Framework. These Policies seek, amongst other matters, to promote good design and to ensure that new development respects the character and appearance of the area.

Other Considerations

12. Within the vicinity of the appeal site is a Grade II Listed Building. The Council raise no concerns in respect of the effect of the development upon the setting of the listed building, and taking into account the distance of the proposal from

[2] 17/03679/PLF and 18/40064/NONMAT
[3] 13/02043/STOUT and 19/03531/STPLF

the asset, and the intervening position of the host dwelling, I have no reason to consider otherwise. The scheme would not interrupt views of the listed building, nor would it have any notable impact upon how the listed building is experienced. Consequently, I am satisfied that the development would have a neutral effect on the heritage asset and its setting.

13. I acknowledge that the proposal would not cause harm to the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties, however, this is also a neutral factor, which does not weigh in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

L M Wilson

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Anne Jordan

INSPECTOR