



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2022

by C Megginson

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N2739/W/21/3284170

Field View, 64 Wistow Road, Selby YO8 3LY

- 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 John Wilson against the decision of Selby District Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/0518/HPA, dated 22 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'application for the siting of a static caravan for purposes ancillary to the main dwellinghouse at Field View, 64 Wistow Road. The application seeks consent for siting and means of access with all other matters reserved'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Procedural Matter

3. Notwithstanding the description of development set out in the banner heading above, which is taken from the application form, it is evident from the submitted plans and details that the appeal includes the design and material details for the proposed static caravan, and that no matters are reserved. I have therefore considered the appeal on that basis.

Reasons

4. The appeal site contains a dormer bungalow and detached garage with a large, gravelled drive area. Wistow Road is characterised by a linear arrangement of predominantly two storey dwellings with long rear gardens. The appeal site is in an edge of settlement and backland location, set well back from the road and located behind No. 62 Wistow Road. Relatively flat, open countryside lies to the east.
5. The static caravan would be located to the eastern side of the main dwelling, between the dwelling and the boundary with the adjoining property, with the detached garage directly adjacent to the south.
6. The static caravan is currently sited to the north of the dwelling in an open countryside position, which I saw on my site visit. This was subject to a planning application in 2019 and a subsequent joint planning and enforcement appeal both of which were dismissed in 2021.

7. I note that the caravan would not encroach into open countryside any further than the host dwelling. This location would not be as prominent as the current siting of the caravan, however, when viewed from the west, based on my site observations, the southern end of the proposed caravan would be visible, and the proposed cream shiplap PVC cladding would contrast against the darker brickwork of the house and garage. This would stand out as an incongruous and dominant feature in relation to its immediate surroundings, and the wider residential environment of Wistow Road.
8. The appellant states that views to the southeast would be limited to a 25m section of footpath, however, from my site visit, as stated above, I could see that the appeal site is prominent when approaching from the west along Wistow Road and Sherburn Road and can be clearly seen from some distance. Furthermore, harm would also be caused to visual amenity from the area of footpath identified by the appellant, due to the incongruous nature of the caravan when viewed in conjunction with the darker surrounding buildings.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposed static caravan would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. This would be contrary to Policies ENV1 of the Selby District Local Plan (2005), and Policies SP18 and SP19 of the Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan (2013). These policies seek to ensure that new development delivers high quality design and has regard to the local character, identity and context of its surroundings. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, which states in paragraph 130 that planning decisions should ensure that developments will add to the overall quality of the area and are sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole and all other relevant matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C. Megginson

INSPECTOR