The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2023

by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/22/3310865
4 Holly Close, Buckton YO15 1BZ

- 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 Richard Lee against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
- The application Ref 22/02099/PLF, dated 22 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 18 August 2022.
- The development proposed is proposed extension to side and rear of existing dwelling.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Buckton is a small village, characterised by predominantly linear houses that front onto Main Street and Plump Lane. It is a rural village, and there are village farms with farm buildings set back from the road and fields beyond. The appeal property is a former barn which, at the time of my site visit, was in the process of being converted into a residential property. Despite the contemporary design with the use of large glazing, its simple shape and size, along with its location set back away from Main Street, retains the distinctive character of a former barn in a rural setting.

4. The proposed extension would be a significant addition to the existing building. Its two-storey height and width would be a dominant feature from the front. Moreover, its layout, with a small physical link and a gap between the proposal and the existing building for most of the design, would wrap around much of the side and rear elevations of the former barn. This would appear to subsume the host building. The combined proportions, massing, wrap around layout, contrasting hipped and flat roof structure to the swimming pool, and dormer style windows to the front, would fail to harmonise with the character of the former barn.

5. Due to the wrap around design, the full extent of the proposal would not be seen in public views. However, it would be seen from private views and even cumulative and incremental localised changes of this kind can erode the character and quality of an area.

6. Although the site is not prominent from Main Street, the building is on an elevated position at the end of Holly Close, and its frontage becomes increasingly prominent on the approach upwards toward the building. There is no uniformity in the design of the buildings within the group in Holly Close. However, the other buildings have distinctly low heights. In this regard, the striking contrast between the smaller buildings, and the cumulative massing of the proposal would accentuate the harm I have identified.

7. The use of matching materials, position set back from the front façade and height being no higher than the former barn would not be sufficient to harmonise the proposal with the host building or overcome my concerns.

8. To conclude, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Policy S4C of the East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document (ERLPSD) (2016) does not specifically say that future extensions to converted disused buildings are subject to the same requirements as buildings prior to their conversion when assessed against Policy S4C 1 ii. However, my decision does not turn on this specific criterion within Policy S4C, as there would still be harm to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. As such, there would be conflict with the objectives of Policy S4C, which seeks, amongst other things, to accept proposals that respect the intrinsic character of its surroundings.

9. I therefore find conflict with the requirements of Policies ENV1 and S4 of the ERLPSD and the provisions of paragraphs 130 and 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) (2021) when taken together. These seek, amongst other things, to promote sustainable rural development, promote the re-use of redundant or disused buildings, good design and recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

10. I accept that the appellants are seeking to improve the living conditions of the property. However, personal circumstances will seldom outweigh more general planning concerns and I must determine the appeal based on the merits of the scheme before me. Such matters, and the absence of harm in relation to other considerations, including the size of the remaining garden space for the occupiers of the property, do not outweigh my concerns relating to the character and appearance of the area.

11. 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.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR