



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2022

by C Coyne BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04/03/2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/21/3282344

64 Buttfield Lane, Howden DN14 7DS

- 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 McGoun against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01792/PLF, dated 28 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is proposed side and rear extensions to dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property, the street scene, and the wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached two storey dwelling with a red-brick façade. It belongs to a row of paired semi-detached dwellings of a similar size, design, and appearance. The surrounding area is predominately residential with there being a variety of house types such as the detached dwellings on the other side of the Buttfield Lane. On my visit I observed that the host property, its neighbour as well of the other pairs of semi-detached dwellings on this side of Buttfield Lane had a visual symmetry when viewed from the street.
4. The proposal would demolish the existing single storey outbuilding to the rear and extend the host property to the rear and side up to first floor level. This would create a new double garage, sunroom, and larger kitchen on the ground floor and two new larger bedrooms, an en suite bathroom and a dressing room on the first floor.
5. Given its size and scale, the proposal would represent a significant extension to the host property. When viewed from the front it would look almost as big as the host property particularly in terms of its width. Consequently, even though its roof ridge height would be slightly lower, and that its external material finish would match that of the existing building, I consider that the proposal would not be visually subservient to the host property when viewed from this direction.

6. Furthermore, a significant proportion of the side/rear element of the extension would project outwards at a two-storey height and would also be almost as wide as the host property. Therefore, for similar reasons I consider that the proposal would not appear to be visually subservient when viewed from the side or rear either. Moreover, given its size, scale and location, the proposal would also visually unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings to which it belongs as well as the other symmetrical pairs of semi-detached dwellings in the row on this side of the lane.
7. As a result, I find that the proposal would represent a disproportionate and discordant addition to the host property and the street scene thereby having a significant adverse visual impact.
8. I note that the side/rear element of the proposal would not be fully visible from the street. However, it would be visible from the public footpath/laneway to the side of the appeal site meaning that it would have an adverse visual impact, nonetheless.
9. I also note the examples of other residential extensions cited by appellant and have details of one of these (no. 76) before me. However, based on the appellant's evidence, the host property in this instance appears to be a detached dwelling and the proposed extension does not appear to be almost as wide as the host property. Consequently, I consider that this scheme is not directly comparable to the appeal scheme. In any event, I have determined the appeal scheme on its own merits and the presence of other residential extensions in the area is not of sufficient weight to overcome or outweigh the harm I have identified above.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would materially harm the character and appearance of the host property, the street scene, and the wider area. Accordingly, it would fail to meet the relevant requirements of Policy ENV1 of the adopted East Riding Local Plan. It would therefore also conflict with paragraphs 126, 130 and 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework and sections C1 and I1 of the National Design Guide.

Other Matters

11. Interested parties have raised a concern in relation to the potential impact of the proposal on the adjacent public footpath. However, as I am dismissing the appeal on other substantive grounds, I have not considered this matter any further.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Coyne

INSPECTOR