



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 October 2022

by D Barlow BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/22/3305270
114 Westlands Road, Sproatley, HU11 4XQ

- 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 and Mrs Miller against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00329/PLF dated 1 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension, loft conversion and front and rear dormer projections.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the front dormer projection. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension, loft conversion and rear dormer projection at 114 Westlands Road, Sproatley, HU11 4XQ in accordance with terms of the application, Ref 22/00329/PLF, dated 1 February 2022, and the plans submitted with it, insofar as they relate to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans (Drawing No GSA/0921/124(2)) insofar as they relate to the single storey rear extension, loft conversion and rear dormer projections. For the avoidance of doubt, this does not include the front dormer projections.
 - 4) The first floor windows to the side and rear to serve the landing and en suite respectively as shown on drawing GSA/0921/124(2) shall be installed with obscure glazing and be non-opening below 1.7M measured from the internal floor level prior to the first occupation of the development.

Procedural Matters

2. The application description omits the erection of bay window to the front, however the Council's refusal notice and the appeal form both state the proposal to be the erection of a single storey extension to rear, erection of bay

window to front and construction of one flat roof dormer to front and one flat roof dormer to rear. As both parties have used this description and the bay window is on the drawings, for the avoidance of doubt, I have taken account of it in determining the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and the host dwelling.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow located half way along Westlands Road. The neighbouring properties are all brick built bungalows but the surrounding area has some one and a half and two storey houses with varying architectural styles in terms of design, scale and materials.
5. The proposed dormer projection to the front is of a large box dormer style, covering the majority of the roof. The scale and design of the proposed front dormer projection is such that it would give rise to a prominent feature that would be significantly at odds with the current appearance of the appeal property and its attached neighbour. It would result in the appeal property having a pronounced asymmetric and so unbalanced appearance, particularly when comparing it to neighbouring properties in this part of Westlands Road.
6. The Appellant has drawn my attention to examples of where similar front dormer projections have been built on the surrounding estate, and I have looked at these in coming to my decision. They have either been originally built as designed, are next to one and a half storey houses, or in less prominent positions in a quiet cul de sac. The locations are quite different to the appeal property. Equally I am not aware when the front dormers were built, or the planning policy in force at the time. The exception is No 99 Westlands Road, but that dormer projection is smaller and only covers half the front roof so is not directly comparable.
7. Consequently I conclude that the proposed front dormer projection would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area and the host dwelling and would be contrary to Policy ENV1 of the East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document (adopted in 2016), which seeks high quality design that contributes to a sense of place and has regard to the character of the surrounding area. There would also be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework Paragraph 130, which seeks good design that should relate to the existing site's local and wider context and local character and identity.
8. Notwithstanding my conclusions above, I find that the proposed single storey rear extension and rear dormer projection are acceptable in form and scale and neither of these proposals would harmfully affect the street scene or the character of the area. They are acceptable in planning terms. Equally the proposed bay window to the front of the host property causes no unacceptable harm to the character or appearance of the area. These elements of the proposal accord with Policy ENV1 of the East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document. It is noteworthy that the Council found similarly in respect of these matters.

Other Matters

9. I note that nearby occupiers have concerns regarding potential structural issues relating to the proposal, however I have had no evidence put before me to indicate this would occur. Concern has also been raised over the height, siting and potential loss of light to nearby properties of the proposed extension. Due to its limited height and depth the proposal is unlikely to result in any loss of light to the attached property to the degree that would be harmful to its occupiers' living conditions. This is also in line with the Council's position on this matter.
10. I have also noted comments and concerns from other third parties, but I am satisfied that there are no issues raised which would affect my decision.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission I have specified the approved plans for certainty. For the avoidance of doubt, the front dormer projection is not permitted via this condition. A condition relating to materials is necessary to ensure that the character and appearance of the area is protected. The condition regarding obscure glazing to the South and West windows to serve the landing and en suite are necessary to ensure no unacceptable overlooking occurs to the occupiers of the neighbouring property.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed for the erection of single storey rear extension, loft extension and rear dormer and dismissed in relation to the front dormer projection.

D Barlow

INSPECTOR