



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 July 2023

by P J G Ware BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 26th July 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/23/3322096
75, Castle Drive, South Cave HU15 2ES

- 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 Andy Sandham against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01870/PLF, dated 6 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey extension to the rear of the garage and the construction of two dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey extension to the rear of the garage and the construction of two dormers at 75, Castle Drive, South Cave HU15 2ES in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/01870/PLF, dated 6 June 2022, 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 following approved plans: Location plan LA09056L; existing elevations, site plan, floor plan, building view plan APS 0375-1; proposed site plan APS 0375-2 sheet 3; proposed elevations APS 0375 - 2 -sheet 2; existing ground floor plan and existing and proposed first floor plan APS 0375 - 2 sheet 4; existing elevations and isometric views APS 0375 - 2 - sheet 1.

Main issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The property is a two-storey detached dwelling with garaging and a carport to the front, linked to the main house. Due to the orientation of the house both the front of the building and the garage/carport effectively face forwards onto the road. The property is at the end of a cul-de-sac in an overwhelmingly residential area, and a number of the other houses in the vicinity have similar garages. The proposal is to extend the garage and insert dormer windows in the elevation facing the street.
4. The relevant development plan policy is ENV1 of the East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document (2016) which seeks to ensure that development proposals achieve a high quality of design. Regard should be had to the wider context and character of the area, and proposals should have an appropriate scale, density, massing, height and material, and have regard to the amenity of existing properties.
5. The Council's concern is that the scale of the proposal in this forward location would detract from the appearance of the host building and the area. The authority notes that the proposed ridge height would be level with the eaves of the main building. Whilst I can appreciate this concern, the property is an unusual one in that the existing forward extension, facing the road as it does, is already a notable feature in the streetscene at the end of the cul-de-sac and the increase in height – still well below the ridge of the main house – would not appear out of character. The submitted plans clearly demonstrate that the proposal would remain visually subservient to the host property.
6. The proposal would certainly represent an increase in the massing of the front of the property, but not to such an extent that the character of the host property would be harmed. Nor would the overall character of the area be adversely affected. The Council characterise the area as having a degree of uniformity but, having spent some time in the cul-de-sac and the surrounding residential area, I was struck by the extent of the variety of design approaches.
7. The detail of the design, including the materials, is not dissimilar to a number of the properties I observed in the surrounding area. Whilst none of these are directly comparable to the appeal property or the current proposal, they illustrate the degree of variety in the area. In particular the neighbouring property has been altered in a not-dissimilar fashion, and the proposed materials (which can be the subject of a condition) reflect the existing property.
8. The Council's report, though not the reason for refusal, refers to design guidance. However I give this very little weight as it is not part of the development plan and is described by the Council as informal.
9. I am conscious that an appeal was dismissed last year for a similar proposal at the property.¹ However the current proposal includes a reduced ridge height and a reduction in the scale of the dormers. So, although that decision is a material consideration, it relates to a significantly different proposal.
10. I am aware that the appeal site is adjacent to the South Cave Conservation Area. However it has not been suggested that the proposal would be visible from the designated area or have any effect on it. The Council accepts that the

¹ APP/E2001/D/21/3281451

proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. I have no reason to disagree.

11. For the above reasons the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the host property or the streetscene. It would not conflict with policy ENV1 or national design policy.
12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

P. J. G. Ware
Inspector