
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 October 2021

by Diane Cragg DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/21/3274144

61 Main Street, Hutton Cranswick, YO25 9QN

- 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 Paul Sedman against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00326/PLF, dated 28 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is 1: Remove current rendering from front and rear of property and replace with insulation and rendering. 2: Insulate and render gable end of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in July 2021 and I have had regard to it in reaching my decision.

Main Issue

3. Whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Cranswick Conservation Area (CCA)

Reasons

4. The Cranswick Conservation Area Appraisal July 2006 identifies that the significance of the CCA derives, in part, from the historic village being clustered around The Green. The tight knit built development contrasts with the open character of The Green and The Green affords clear views of development surrounding it. Properties along Main Street are in a linear form and close to the back edge of the highway. Dwellings are generally two storeys and brick is the predominant walling material, although there is render in evidence in a mixture of textures.
5. No 61 Main Street is an end of terrace property, one in a row of three cottages said to date from 1851. The original brick work of the cottage has been rendered to the front and rear and the brick to the side gable has been painted. The three cottages are not especially prominent in the street scene but their siting, simple form, continuous eaves line and similarity in the size and form of window and door openings add to the built frontage along Main Street.

Consequently, the cottages contribute positively to the character and appearance of the CCA.

6. Insulated render to the front elevation would add to the depth of the property and this would be particularly noticeable at the eaves line, in the depth of the window and door reveals and along the line of the joint boundary with the attached cottage. The additional depth to the front elevation would appear incongruous with the character of the adjacent cottages and noticeably change the similarity between them. Consequently, the contribution of the row of cottages to the street scene would be diminished. The changes to the front elevation of the cottage would be clearly visible from The Green and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the CCA
7. At the rear of the property the additional insulation and replacement render would not be prominent. The later alterations and additions to the rear elevations of the cottages would also limit the effect of the insulation depth.
8. The narrow driveway between No 61 and the adjacent detached property limits the visibility of the painted brickwork side gable of the appeal property in the street scene. While the texture of the brick work would be lost, due to the brickwork being painted the rendered gable would not appear significantly different in the street scene and the effect on the cottages historic value would be limited. In addition, the depth of the insulation on the side elevation is less than to the front and rear and would have limited effect on the eaves line. An appropriate eaves detail could be sought by condition. Overall, I am satisfied that the insulated render to the gable wall and rear of the cottage would not in principle be detrimental to the appearance of the CCA.
9. My attention is drawn to a similar scheme for external insulation and cladding at No 12 Main Street. I saw at my site visit that this property is not as prominent in the conservation area because of its location on the approach to The Green from Beverley Road. Further, the plans for that scheme indicate that the insulation depth to the front elevation is less. Nevertheless, even if they were the same, I am not persuaded that the proposal would be a suitable solution for the front elevation of the appeal property for the reasons I have set out.
10. The appellant is confident that the proposed insulation would eliminate condensation rather than exacerbate moisture related problems in the building. The Council has provided limited evidence to support its concerns regarding thermal performance. Therefore, I have no reason to conclude that the insulation would be detrimental to the building in this respect.
11. Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. In addition, the Framework requires great weight to be given to the conservation of heritage assets. The proposal would be modest, and in the terminology of the Framework it would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the CCA as a designated heritage asset. Paragraph 202 of the Framework states that where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of heritage assets, that harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

12. The Framework supports development that mitigates climate change. Although not quantified, the insulation of the building would likely reduce energy consumption. Even so, in the absence of any quantifiable evidence I can only attach moderate weight to the benefit of reduced energy consumption. While I have not found harm due to the insulation of the side gable or the rear elevation of the building in themselves these visual changes to the cottage are neutral and do not weigh in favour of the proposal. Overall, the moderate public benefits would not outweigh the great weight to be attached to the conservation of heritage assets and the proposal would therefore conflict with the Framework.
13. Overall, the development would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CCA and would conflict with Policy ENV3 of the East Riding Local Plan 2012-2029 Strategic Document where it seeks to ensure that the key features that contribute to the East Riding's distinctive historic character is conserved. It would also conflict with the Framework.

Other Matters

14. At my site visit I noted the location of nearby listed buildings and I agree with the parties that the development would not detract from their setting.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR