



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 June 2020 by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/20/3248225

2 Manor Barns, Little Weighton HU20 3UA

- 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 Dukes against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 19/03839/PLF, dated 6 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

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 extension on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. No. 2 Manor Barns is a mid-terrace dwelling. The building was recently converted from an agricultural building to residential use. It is an attractive dwelling and its simple design is sympathetic to its agricultural origins. The conversion appears to have been carefully planned to retain the outward character of the former barn, with relatively few window and door openings, particularly on the rear elevation facing the road which retains a simple and functional appearance. To ensure that any alterations and extensions would retain the character and appearance of the former agricultural buildings a condition removing permitted development rights was attached to the conversion application¹. The building is not listed and is not located within a conservation area.
5. The appeal site is regarded as the countryside because it is located outside the defined development limits of Little Weighton. The site is also located within an area which is locally designated as an Important Landscape Area (ILA). Policy S4 of the East Riding Local Plan 2012–2029: Strategy Document (2016) (LP) is

¹ 00/04010/PLF

relevant for development within the countryside. Amongst other matters, it states that development will be supported where it is of an appropriate scale to its location and respects the intrinsic character of its surroundings. The supporting text associated with the policy goes on to state that development limits are not intended to exclude the prospect of extensions to residential dwellings where these are of an appropriate size and respectful to the character of the area.

6. Policy ENV1 of the LP seeks to ensure that development proposals achieve a high quality of design by, amongst other matters, having an appropriate scale, density, massing, height and material. The proposal seeks to amend the existing porch to the rear and erect a single storey extension. Matching materials would be used to reflect the existing property. The existing porch is in keeping with the character of the building due to its scale, roof design and use of timber.
7. The ridge height of the lean-to roof would be out of keeping with the host building as it would result in an awkward relationship with the existing first floor windows. As noted above, the simple form and appearance of the former agricultural building was retained in the conversion, particularly on the northern aspect which has a linear form with relatively few alterations, save for the modest porch. In that context, the substantial lean to would be a prominent addition which would appear at odds with the building and the adjoining terraces which do not have rear projections. The large glazing to the rear of the extension, and to part of the western elevation, would not reflect the size and proportion of the existing windows and would further domesticate the appearance of the building. The form, scale and massing of the proposed extension would therefore result in a dominant addition which would not be in keeping with the simple character and appearance of the host building.
8. Policy ENV2 of the LP seeks to promote a high-quality landscape. The extension would be to a small degree visible from the highway as it passes the entrance to the site. To the rear of the site is a footpath along White Gap Road. The rear of the appeal property is partially visible from the highway because of the pedestrian gate which results in a gap in the boundary hedge. Similarly, due to the height of the extension, it would also be partly visible when entering Manor Barns, across the rear garden of No. 1 Manor Barns. Nevertheless, the extension would have a negligible impact upon the surrounding area as it would be set back from the highway behind dense vegetation. Thus, it would be largely screened from public vantage points and the harmful impact would be localised such that it would not cause wider harm to the designated ILA nor countryside setting.
9. I note that the Parish Council did not object to the proposal and that the Council considered the extension to be acceptable in terms of its impact upon neighbouring properties. However, these considerations do not outweigh the harm identified above.
10. For these reasons, the proposed development would not have a materially harmful effect on the character and appearance of the wider area but it would harm the character and appearance of the host building. Consequently, it would conflict with Policies S4 and ENV1 of the LP. It would also be at odds with guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework relating to achieving high quality design.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

L M Wilson

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. 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.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR