



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 September 2020

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/20/3255266

Dale Cottage, 33 Dale Road, Elloughton, Brough HU15 1HY

- 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 Graham Crawley against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00536/PLF, dated 17 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of single-storey extension and erection of replacement two-storey extension with associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. During the course of the appeal it became apparent that the Council had not advertised the planning application as required by Regulation 5A of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Regulations 1990. The Council was requested to advertise the application appropriately, and I am satisfied that this has been done. The Council has confirmed that it did not receive any comments as a result of the further publicity carried out.
3. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form which differs from that on the Council's decision notice. In Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed and neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the area, with due regard to the Elloughton (Dale Road) Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal proposal relates to a two storey dwelling with a large garden to the side. Although the building is of a small scale; its hipped roof, chimneys and fenestration give the side elevation a relatively handsome character which emphasises its 19th Century origins. Due to the open aspect provided by the

garden, the side elevation is prominent in the streetscape when approached from the north. The traditional appearance of the side elevation as well as the views enabled of the larger building at 31 Dale Road make a positive contribution to the area. There is an unsympathetic flat roofed extension to the ground floor of the side elevation, but the original form of the building is still apparent. The appellant contends that the dwelling does not have any intrinsic merit in design terms, but for the reasons stated previously I disagree.

6. The site is located in the Elloughton (Dale Road) Conservation Area (CA) which derives its significance as a designated heritage asset from the historical development of the village made up of buildings set in a well treed landscape, as well as the broader appreciation of traditional Wolds villages in this area. This is set out in the CA Appraisal, and whilst the appellant contends that this is out of date due to development in the area and changes in planning policy, I saw that the Appraisal provides a suitable assessment of the CA's significance.
7. Whilst the appeal site may not be specifically mentioned in the CA appraisal and is not listed, this does not diminish the contribution it makes to the character and appearance of the area and the CA. Although the CA Appraisal refers to the importance of trees in the CA, the built environment is also important.
8. The proposal consists of a two-storey extension on the side elevation. This would extend over approximately two thirds of the elevation and would project a significant distance beyond the main wall. Due to the massing of the proposed extension, it would appear as an overdominant addition which would diminish the appreciation of the original form of the dwelling and lead to significant harm to its traditional appearance. Whilst it is proposed to use windows at first floor level of a design matching the existing windows, the extension would obscure much of the side elevation and would not reflect the location of windows on the original building. This would result in an extension and side elevation of a clumsy appearance which would significantly detract from the appreciation of the original form of the host building. The unacceptable scale of the extension would be emphasised further by the relatively featureless front elevation projecting beyond the side wall of the main building.
9. The extension would also disrupt the relationship with No 31, which has an attractive roofscape and eaves detailing, and which appears as a higher status building compared to the appeal site. In views from the north, the appeal site and No 31 are viewed together, and the subservience of the appeal site to No 31 is apparent and contributes to the appreciation of the built form of the CA. The proposal would partially obscure the roof of No 31 in near distance views of the site. Moreover, the proposal would be of a scale which would disrupt the relationship between the two sites, to the detriment of the contribution they make to the appearance of the area.
10. It is proposed to remove the unsympathetic ground floor extension on the property, which would be a benefit. However, this benefit would be outweighed by the significant harm arising from the unsympathetic design and scale of the proposed two-storey extension.
11. The proposal would enable improvements to accommodation at the dwelling. However, this is a private benefit and it has not been demonstrated that the

- existing accommodation is fundamentally unsuitable or that the long term future of the building, and investment in it, is at risk.
12. The appellant expresses concerns about inaccuracies in the Council's consideration of the scale of the proposal, and this reflects my own observations based on the evidence before me. However, this does not lead me to a different conclusion in respect of the harm arising from the appeal proposal.
 13. The appellant refers to an approved extension to a bungalow adjacent to the appeal site. However, this is a modern building outside the CA and the circumstances of that site are materially different to the appeal before me. Reference has also been made to planning permission granted for outbuildings to the rear of the appeal site. However I have not been provided with full details of this scheme, and so cannot be certain it represents a parallel to the appeal proposal on matters including the original use of the site, the long term retention of the buildings and the contribution to housing. In any event, I have determined this appeal on its own merits.
 14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would be of a design and scale that would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the area. The proposal would also harm the character and appearance of the CA, and whilst that harm may be less than substantial, there are no public benefits that would outweigh that harm.
 15. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies ENV1 and ENV3 of the East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document 2016 with regards to achieving high quality design and conserving the character and appearance of the CA. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of achieving well-designed places as well as conserving and enhancing the historic environment.
 16. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR