



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2023

by F Wilkinson BSc (Hons), MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/23/3321924

154 Hull Road, Woodmansey, East Riding of Yorkshire HU17 0TH

- 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 Matthew Millington against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 22/03689/PLF, dated 13 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 2 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension 5000mm x 9322mm.
-

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 building and area.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a semi-detached single storey dwelling that is separated from Hull Road by the adjoining property at no. 152. It lies within the Countryside under the terms of Policy S4 of the East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document (the ERLPSD) due to its location outside of any defined development limit. The dwelling is one of a number of properties scattered along Hull Road between the two more built-up parts of Woodmansey. Despite its relative proximity to the settlement, the area in which the dwelling is located nevertheless has an open rural character and appearance.
4. The supporting text to Policy S4 of the ERLPSD clarifies that development limits are not intended to exclude the prospect of extensions to residential dwellings where these are of an appropriate size and respectful to the character of the area. Policy ENV1 of the ERLPSD requires development to be well designed, to safeguard and respect the diverse character and appearance of the area, and to contribute to a sense of place including through having an appropriate scale, density, massing, height and material, amongst other matters. The Council's Design Guidance for Home Extensions provides advice on the size and scale of extensions, including that an extension which is larger than the existing dwelling will appear out of scale, and will tend to make the whole building seem unbalanced.
5. The dwelling currently comprises what appears to be the original house which is a modest cottage with a pitched red pantile roof, and a single storey flat roof extension to the rear. Although the existing rear extension is not insubstantial

in size, it does not unduly dominate the original dwelling, or significantly alter its simple rural character. The proposed development would be a significant addition to this current extension, regardless of the materials used, representing a substantial elongation of the host dwelling.

6. The flat roof of the existing extension would be replaced with a pitched roof that would have a width greater than the original part of the dwelling. This would continue over part of the proposed extension. The rear most part of the proposed extension would incorporate another pitch roof that would run parallel to the roof of the original dwelling and would also be wider than the original part of the property.
7. The scale and massing of the proposed extension would not provide an appropriate level of subordination with the host dwelling. Instead, it would overwhelm the noticeably modest original dwelling. The introduction of the second ridge parallel to that of the original dwelling would further frustrate the existing visual appearance of the building.
8. Overall, the proposed development would have a dominating effect on the host dwelling that would be incompatible with its simple rural character and form. This would be very evident from Hull Road.
9. In terms of other properties in the area, I note that the dwelling at 152 Hull Road has been extended. However, these extensions appear to have a reasonably simple form, with a single ridge and lower hipped roof to the rear and so appear as subordinate to the host dwelling.
10. The proposed development would increase the living space at the property without harming the living conditions of neighbouring residents. However, this would not outweigh the harm that I have found.
11. For the above reasons, the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the host building and its surroundings. Consequently, it would conflict with Policies S4 and ENV1 of the ERLPSD as summarised above. It would also conflict with the design objectives in paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy C1 of the National Design Guide.

Conclusion

12. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate a decision otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

F Wilkinson

INSPECTOR