The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 June 2020

by C Dillon BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N2739/D/20/3252271
Sycamore Cottage, Ryther, Tadcaster, North Yorkshire LS24 9EP

- 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 Mrs Kay McKenna against the decision of Selby District Council.
- The application Ref 2019/1346/HPA, dated 17 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 April 2020.
- The development proposed is described as proposed single storey extensions to the south/east corner of the existing building.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The address contained within the above heading is that which the appellant specified on the planning application form, whereas the Council's decision notice and the appellant's appeal form refer to 'Sycamores Cottage'. Notwithstanding this, from my site inspection and the submitted plans, I am satisfied that the main parties refer to the same site.

3. The submitted plans include a pergola. Although that is not specifically referenced in any of the descriptions provided, it conjoins the proposed bedroom extensions and, from the evidence submitted I am satisfied that it formed part of the extension proposals that the Council both consulted and based their decision upon. Thus, in the interests of consistency the appeal proceeds on that basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, associated building group and wider area with particular regard to size, scale, form and previous extensions.

Reasons

5. The appeal site forms part of a complex of buildings of varying heights and design. The evidence before me confirms that the original dwelling was extended to create commercial floor space and the complex was subsequently converted into separate units. The majority of the appeal property's living accommodation is contained within a single storey building attached to a two storey section. It has a narrow, linear form and is constructed from brick and

clay pantiles. Although the submitted evidence disputes the original use of the building complex, I observed that the predominant character and appearance of this part of the building group is governed by this particular form, much smaller scale and simple rustic design.

6. The site is well landscaped to the extent that it screens out longer distance views into the site from the surrounding countryside beyond. The positioning of the proposed extensions is such that their visibility would be more localised, from the approach through the adjoining chalet park. Although the appeal proposals would be read against the wider complex of buildings, the existence of the surrounding buildings and structures would not diminish their prominence.

7. The extension proposed nearest the courtyard entrance would elongate the existing single storey part of the host property in a manner that would respect its original linear form, roof design and simple, rustic character and appearance. However, at the same time it would protrude beyond the prominently situated collective elevation that it shares with the wider building group. This protrusion would unduly disturb the otherwise dominant, though compacted form of the wider building group which envelops the original building. As such, it would be significantly harmful to that important characteristic of the building group.

8. Furthermore, the extension proposed on what is annotated as the 'south elevation' would unduly interrupt the simple, but important linear form of the host with its protrusion at a right angle. This would be further exacerbated by the proposed pergola which would connect the two extensions and thereby reinforce this protrusion at the most prominent corner of the host building. Further significant harm would therefore result to the simple but strong, linear form that defines the character and appearance of this part of the host building and the wider building group.

9. The size of the appeal proposals in terms of height and footprint is such that they would be subordinate in scale to the host property and wider building group. Sufficient useable private amenity space would be retained to serve the cottage. I find no harm in these respects. However, the harm that I have identified would not be diminished by these matters or through the general design attributes of the scheme in terms of materials and fenestration pattern that would reflect the existing property. Neither would the identified harm be diminished by the appeal site's seclusion from longer distance views.

10. In terms of cumulative effects, I observed that this complex of unlisted buildings has been significantly extended in the past. This reflects the organic evolution of the site from its initial origins and forms part of its somewhat unique character which the Council seeks to maintain. Furthermore, I have found that the site is relatively well screened from all but localised views. I note the assessment undertaken by the Council in assessing the proportionate increase that would result in the context of Policy H14 of the Selby District Local Plan (adopted 8 February 2005). However, irrespective of this, I have identified a significant detrimental impact upon the important form of the host building and wider building group, and I find this to be the determining factor in this particular instance.

11. For the reasons given above, I find that the addition of the proposed extensions and pergola would present significant harm to the character and

appearance of the host dwelling and wider building group by virtue of their form.

12. Saved Policy ENV1 of the Local Plan permits proposals that provide a good quality of development, taking into account, amongst things the effect upon the character of the area and the standard of design and materials in relation to the site and its surroundings. Furthermore, saved Policy H14 of that plan states that in such locations extensions to existing dwellings will be permitted providing that, amongst other things, they are appropriate to their setting, would not dominate visually and the design and materials would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the dwelling and other buildings in the area. In addition, Policy SP19 of the Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan (adopted 22 October 2013) expects new development to have regard to local character, identity and context and positively contribute to the area's identity including in terms of scale and layout.

13. Given the nature and level of harm that I have identified, I find conflict with these polices and therefore with the development plan when taken as a whole.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons give above, the appeal should be dismissed.

C Dillon

INSPECTOR