



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 24 May 2021

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N2739/D/21/3269862

Orchard House, Back Lane, Riccall, York YO19 6PT

- 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 Agnes Goodrick against the decision of Selby District Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/1164/HPA, dated 26 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion including three new rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building, with due regard to the Riccall Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached dwelling located on a corner site adjacent to a junction. Although the proposed dormers are located to the rear of the building, due to the arrangement of the site the rear elevation and roofslope are prominent features within the streetscape.
4. The CA is characterised by a variety of buildings representing different phases in the historical development of the village. The CA Assessment¹ refers to the character of the village being unified by the use of common building materials, including roofing materials. These matters contribute to the importance of the CA as a designated heritage asset. The CA Assessment also emphasises the harm arising from inappropriate window designs.
5. The predominant roof form in the village is of simple dual pitched types, and dormer windows are not a traditional characteristic. Although there are a variety of building designs and arrangements in the vicinity of the site, the prevailing character of the roofscape is of a simple uncluttered nature. Within this context, the proposed dormer windows would appear as incongruous features introducing a cluttered appearance to the rear roofslope.
6. Furthermore, the proposed windows are of an unsuitable design which would project close to the ridge and eaves of the roof. Due to their scale and number, they would be overdominant features in views of the rear, exacerbating the harm arising from the unduly cluttered appearance of the proposal. The

¹ Riccall: A Review of the Special Architectural and Historic Interest of the Village, 1995.

- inappropriate fenestration design and the extent of facing material between the window apertures and the roof would add to this ungainly appearance.
7. The appellant refers to a number of other dormer windows in the village, within and outside of the CA. However, these are not a common feature in the village, and particularly the CA. Indeed, some of the dormers I saw served to confirm the harm arising from the incongruous and cluttered appearance of this form of development. Reference has been made to dormer windows in close proximity to the appeal site, although I have not been provided with details of the circumstances that led to those proposals being accepted and so cannot be sure that they represent a direct parallel to the appeal proposal. In particular, I saw that there are dormer windows on a nearby dwelling on Back Lane, however these are of a sympathetic design which does not dominate the roofslope and reflect the character and arrangement of windows in the main elevations.
 8. I conclude that, due to their design and location, the proposed dormer windows would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building, and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Whilst the harm to the CA would be less than substantial, there are no public benefits arising from the proposal which would outweigh that harm. The proposal would therefore conflict with policies ENV1 and ENV25 of the Selby District Local Plan 2005 as well as policies SP18 and SP19 of the Council's Core Strategy 2013 in respect of design quality and the harm to the CA. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of conserving and enhancing the historic environment.
 9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR