



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 May 2023

by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/23/3317569

3 Old Hall Farm Cottages, Sunk Island, East Yorkshire HU12 0EE

- 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 Barker against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 22/03189/PLF, dated 26 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 8 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Single storey side extension with hipped roof. Part retrospective application for porch to front'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council's decision notice includes an amended description for the proposal and states 'Erection of a single storey extension to side, erection of porch and construction of bay window to front (part retrospective)'. On my site visit I saw that the porch and bay window are already in situ. I have therefore considered the appeal on the basis that proposal includes the elements described on the Council's decision notice and that permission is sought part retrospectively.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Sunk Island Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The East Riding of Yorkshire Council Sunk Island Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) confirms that the CA is notable for its groups of farm buildings and isolated cottages spread throughout the landscape. It confirms that the character of the CA is defined by the isolation of each building group and their carefully considered details in both design and materials.
5. No 3 Old Hall Farm Cottages along with its neighbour at No 4 form a pair of semi-detached cottages. They are situated in the middle of a ribbon development consisting of three pairs of semi-detached cottages. As is the case with the other semi-detached pairs in the row, the appeal dwelling has very similar characteristics to its attached neighbour at No 4. In particular, the facing brickwork, the flush alignment of their principal elevations, their comparable width and their matching roof forms. This gives this semi-detached pair a pleasing degree of symmetry in views from Old Hall Road and is

consistent with the carefully considered details which are characteristic of the CA, thereby adding to its significance.

6. Even though the single storey extension would be modest in height, its width would compete with the width of the front elevation of the host dwelling. In addition, the bay windows and porch would combine to further differentiate the host dwelling from the more simple form and detailing of its attached neighbour at No 4. As a result, the symmetry to the front elevations of this pair of cottages would be unacceptably diminished. This would be evident in views through the site access and over the front boundary hedge for passers-by on Old Hall Road.
7. Having regard to the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the CA. The Framework states that where a development would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
8. The extension would increase the internal floor area of the dwelling resulting in a private benefit for occupiers of the dwelling. The Council's Officer report also refers to solar panels being provided. However, no details have been provided as part of the appeal submission and there is nothing before me to suggest the provision of solar panels is inextricably linked to the extension or, in the event that it was, that it would result in public benefits of a significant magnitude. In the circumstances, there are not public benefits in this instance sufficient to outweigh the harm to the significance of the CA.
9. I conclude, the development would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. In that regard, the development would conflict with the design, context, character, appearance and conservation requirements of Policy ENV1 (Integrating high quality design) and ENV3 (Valuing our heritage) of the East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document (2016) and the Framework.
10. For the same reasons, the development would also conflict with the design, context and heritage guidance in Sections C1 and C2 of the Government's National Design Guide (published 2021).

Conclusion

11. The proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. The proposal therefore conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR