The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 July 2020

by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N2739/W/20/3249407
Land adjacent to The Firs, Caudle Hill, Fairburn, Knottingley WF11 9JQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Carl Price against the decision of Selby District Council.
- The application Ref 2019/0268/OUT, dated 15 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 September 2019.
- The development proposed was originally described as construction of a single dwelling and detached garage.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The proposal is in outline form with approval sought for details of access, layout and scale. Matters relating to appearance and landscaping are reserved for subsequent approval.

3. The Council's decision was based on the revised drawing ref. A(10)0001 Rev D. This drawing indicates parking would be located to the rear of the proposed dwelling and does not propose a garage. My decision is also based on an assessment of this revised layout.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. Caudle Hill is predominantly characterised by residential development set within a semi-rural setting. Whilst dwellings are generally of traditional form, there are a mix of house types and a variety of designs in the area. The Firs is a detached bungalow positioned within a row of gable sided dwellings with similarly pitched roofs. The neighbouring split level dwelling at Swan Acres also sits within this row. The shared characteristics to this row of dwellings and the sloped topography of the street means there is a degree of continuity to the roofscape which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.

6. The irregular shape of the plot dictates that the dwelling would be narrower in width than the dwellings it would sit between. Consequently, the roof form on the dwelling would differ to the row of gable sided dwellings. The indicative

floor plans show that living space would be incorporated into the roof. This has the potential to increase the height of the dwelling above the ridge lines of the neighbouring dwellings to either side. Combined with the alternative shape of the roof, this would be likely to increase the prominence of the dwelling and emphasise the alternative design approach to the point that the dwelling would appear incongruous within the street scene. In such circumstances, the position of the dwelling set back from the highway and the existence of vegetation to the street frontage would not disguise the detrimental impact of the proposal, particularly when viewed from higher ground on Caudle Hill.

7. I acknowledge that the appearance of the dwelling is a reserved matter. However, taking the above factors into account and in the absence of details to demonstrate otherwise, I am not convinced that the proposed layout and scale of the dwelling would assimilate a building of different form into this section of Caudle Hill.

8. My attention has been drawn to photographs of developments in London. However, they do not persuade me that the dwelling would successfully integrate with its site-specific surroundings.

9. I conclude that the proposal has the potential to have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, the development would conflict with the design requirements of Policy ENV1 of the Selby District Local Plan Adoption Draft (2005), Policies SP4 (Management of Residential Development in Settlements) and SP19 (Design Quality) of the Selby District Core Strategy (2013) and Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out, the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR