



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 September 2021 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N2739/D/21/3274545

Crossing Cottage, West Bank, Carlton, Selby, DN14 9PZ

- 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 & Mrs Tomlinson against the decision of Selby District Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/0835/HPA, dated 6 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing conservatory and proposed two storey rear extension and single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the surrounding countryside.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property comprises a two-storey detached dwelling. The site is adjacent to a collection of residential and agricultural buildings situated along Hirst Road to the west, however the site falls outside of any settlement boundary and is therefore located in the open countryside. Owing to the presence of the railway line and level crossing next to the site and as no other properties are visible from the appeal site, the property has a sense of detachment from the nearest buildings along Hirst Road.
 5. The name, position and design of the dwelling betray its historical association with the railway line, with many typical Victorian features, including the steeply pitched roof with overhanging eaves, central chimney stack and well-balanced fenestration with attractive curved brick headers, painted white to contrast with the brickwork of the dwelling. The distinctive design and position of the property are such that it is an attractive feature in the local landscape. The existing flat-roof garage and rear single-storey element are finished in render which is unsympathetic to the original property. The proposed extensions would replace these elements and would be finished in materials that match
-

the original property, although the new windows would not have sill and header detailing found elsewhere on the dwelling. Furthermore, in contrast to the simple form of the original, with its steep roof pitch and characteristic overhanging eaves, the proposed roof form with varying angles of pitch and areas with a flat-roof would result in a complex and confused appearance that would fail to reflect the simple and balanced proportions of the original dwelling.

6. In particular, the rear elevation would see an additional gable in the roof itself, followed by a set down in height with two half-gables with an unusual flat roofed section between. Beyond that would be a further flat roofed single storey element with a balcony/ balustrade. That elaborate arrangement of rooflines would contrast awkwardly against the attractive and simple roof form of the original railway cottage.
7. Moreover, the proposed extensions would almost double the volume of the building from its original size. The considerable scale of the extensions together with the complex roof form would result in a proposal that would not reflect the modest proportions or simple T-shaped form of the original dwelling and would visually dominate it. Although the extensions would be to the rear of the property, they would still be visible from both directions along Hirst Road and from those passing on the railway line. Consequently, the proposal would be disproportionate in scale, would cause harm to the character and appearance of a distinctive rural dwelling, thereby causing associated harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding landscape and countryside.
8. For these reasons, the proposal would conflict with policy H14 of the LP. The proposal would also fail to comply with policy ENV1 of the LP and policy SP19 of the Selby District Core Strategy (2013). These policies both seek to ensure that development is of a high-quality design that has regard to the character of the area and the layout and design of the site.
9. The LP was adopted in 2005, however paragraph 219 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that existing local development plan policies should not be considered out-of-date simply because they were adopted prior to the publication of the Framework, and that due weight should be given to them according to their consistency with the Framework. Policy H14 of the LP essentially sets criteria with the aim of ensuring that extensions to dwellings in the countryside are well designed, having regard to their setting, scale, appearance and use of materials. Those criteria are consistent with the design aims of the Framework and I attach weight to the conflict with policy H14 accordingly.

Other Matters

10. My attention has been drawn to two nearby planning permissions for extensions to houses in the countryside, at Keepers Cottage in Gateforth (planning application ref. 2018/0575/HPA) and The Manor at Malt Kiln Farm in West Haddlesey (planning application ref. 2020/0714/HPA). In both cases, the approved extensions have a smaller increase in volume to the original dwelling, 71% and 59% respectively, and both properties are in closer proximity and with little or no visual separation to the neighbouring properties. As such these cases are not directly comparable to the proposal before me.

11. I note that no representations were received from local residents or from Carlton Parish Council during the original planning application. However, the lack of objections does not alter my conclusion on the harm that would arise.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed because of the conflict with the development plan and there being no material considerations which indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR