



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2020

by A Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/W/20/3248954

3 Grange Road, West Cowick DN14 9EL

- 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 Daniel Tupling against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 19/03563/PLF, dated 15/10/2019, was refused by notice dated 20 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of a two bedroom detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The lengthy description of development on the application form includes reasons why the proposal is sought and other superfluous information, so I have used a more succinct version of the description in the interests of brevity.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area;
 - Whether the development would provide acceptable living conditions for existing and future occupiers, with particular regard to outlook and garden space; and
 - Whether the development would make suitable provision for parking.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The proposal is to construct a dwelling on garden land to the side of No 3, which is a semi-detached house located on the southern side of Grange Road. The proposed dwelling would reflect the design of No 3, but in a narrower detached form and set back further from the road to provide a parking space in front. The neighbouring property No 1 is a detached cottage, which sits perpendicular to the road and along the majority of the boundary with No 3. The plans indicate that a gap of approximately 0.85 metres would be retained to No 1.
5. Grange Road is a narrow lane on the edge of the village. Built development of different ages, size, spacing and orientation is largely continuous on the

southern side of the road, but it becomes more sporadic closer to its junction with Lodge Lane in the vicinity of the appeal site. Here the gaps between houses are notably greater. This gives the lane a more spacious and distinctive semi-rural character at this point.

6. Within this context, the proposed dwelling would reduce the spaciousness of the site and thereby diminish its contribution to the character of this part of Grange Road. The effect would be exacerbated by the very limited gap that would be retained to No 1, the narrow proportions of the dwelling's frontage and the small garden area, which in combination, would result in the development having a cramped and restricted appearance within the site regardless of its roof height and materials. Accordingly, the development would adversely affect the character and appearance of this part of Grange Road.
7. In reasoning the above, I have had regard to the appellant's examples of other narrow and closely spaced dwellings within West Cowick. Some of these appear to be quite historic, while others are possibly later infill developments. Whilst this indicates that the village has developed organically in places, I do not find any of the examples to be directly comparable to the appeal scheme in design and context. Furthermore, I have acknowledged that Grange Road contains houses of different size and spacing, but even so, I have found that the development would be harmful for the reasons set out above.
8. I conclude, on this issue, that the development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. This is contrary to Policies ENV1 and S4 of the East Riding Local Plan 2012-2029 (April 2016) (ERLP). These require all development to safeguard and respect the diverse character and appearance of the area through their design, layout and construction, and having regard to the specific characteristics of the site's context. It is also at odds with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) with regard to achieving well designed places.

Living conditions

9. The size of the garden for the proposed dwelling would be small. Nonetheless, it would still provide a useable area for this small property, and in the absence of being referred to any minimum garden size standards, there are not sufficient grounds for me to find its size insufficient for the future occupiers. Similarly, whilst the garden of No 3 would be substantially reduced, sufficient garden space would remain for its occupiers.
10. That said, both the garden and rear outlook of the proposed dwelling would be severely constrained by the height, length and proximity of No 1. Even allowing for the southerly aspect and large glazed doors serving the ground floor living space, this relationship is likely to be very overbearing and oppressive for the occupiers of the proposed dwelling, both in terms of outlook and use of the garden.
11. Parking would at times also compromise the front outlook from the ground floor window, but as this would be a kitchen window, coupled with the open plan living accommodation, it is not a substantive concern.
12. Drawing these matters together, I conclude that due to the overbearing effect that No 1 would have on the rear outlook and garden of the proposed dwelling, the development would not provide acceptable living conditions for its future

occupiers. This is contrary to ERLP Policy ENV1 and paragraph 127 of the Framework, which together require development to provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Parking

13. The Council's car parking guidelines requires two parking spaces for a 2-3 bedroom dwelling. No 3 currently has two available off-street parking spaces, but this would be reduced to one by the development, which itself would have one off-street parking space. Thus, parking for both the existing and proposed properties would not meet the Council's parking guidelines.
14. I recognise that there is some flexibility in the guidelines depending on factors such as public transport availability and where significant on-street space exists to accommodate parking demand. I have also taken into account that the site is not a remote location. However, Grange Road is a narrow lane with no footways and is further constricted in places by the proximity of roadside boundary enclosures and vegetation, all of which limit opportunities for on-street parking. Parking on the few areas where the verge widens could not be counted on and would make it more difficult for vehicles to pass. In this context, there is no compelling reason to accept reduced parking provision for the development.
15. In light of the above, the absence of adequate off-street parking provision for the existing and proposed dwelling could potentially lead to indiscriminate and obstructive parking on Grange Road. This would interrupt the free flow of traffic on the lane and adversely affect the safety of other road users, including pedestrians.
16. My attention has been drawn to 3-bedroom properties in Snaith that have only one allocated parking space. I do not have any details of the circumstances which led to these developments being accepted, but in any event, I note that they are in a larger settlement and their housing estate settings are not directly comparable to the specific highway context of the appeal site. Thus, these examples do not lead me to a different conclusion on this issue.
17. I conclude, on this issue, that the development would not make suitable provision for parking. This is contrary to ERLP Policy EC4 and the ERLP Sustainable Transport Supplementary Planning Document (2016), where they seek appropriate parking and to ensure development does not prejudice conditions of general highway safety.

Other Matters

18. The appellant refers to a shortage of 2-bedroom properties in the local area, which has not been disputed by the Council. In this regard, the development would add to the supply and choice of housing in the area and thus represents a benefit in favour of the scheme. Nonetheless, this would be at a very small scale so does not outweigh the significant harm identified and the proposal's failure to comply with the policies of the adopted development plan as a whole. The absence of harm in other respects, including drainage, are neutral factors that do not weigh for or against the development.
19. I have noted the other issues raised in the representations that have not been encapsulated above. This includes concerns over privacy, damage to property during construction and maintenance arrangements. However, notwithstanding

some of these matters are outwith the planning considerations of this appeal, I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons so it is not necessary to consider these matters any further, as any findings in these respects would not change the appeal outcome.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR