



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2023

by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/23/3327781

Avon Croft, Station Road, Patrington, East Yorkshire HU12 0NF

- 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 K Davies against the decision of the East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref: 23/00293/PLF, dated 26 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 12 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is a porch to the front of a dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The front porch was completed prior to the application to the Council. It was clear from the application form, and from my site visit, that the name of the property is Avon Croft, rather than "Avoncroft" as referred to by the Council.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and street scene, and the effect on flood risk.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Avon Croft is the end dwelling of a row of traditional two-storey cottages with small narrow front gardens which face Station Road and the open countryside. The front elevations of the cottages vary in appearance through the use of different roofing types and treatment of their front elevations. The cottage known as "Sunnydene" has a small front porch with a mono-pitch roof. Development at either side of the cottages is more recent in date, including detached two-storey dwellings. The nearest of these dwellings to the west have front porch structures. However, they are relatively modest in scale compared with their host buildings and have pitched roofs.
5. Avon Croft has a large modern garage and parking space next to an access at its eastern side. The front porch which has been constructed at Avon Croft has a linear form with a flat roof and extends alongside the boundary of the Cottage known as "Messeda." It projects forward by just under four metres, is around 2.2 metres in height and approximately 1.6 metres in width. The porch appears

modern in design and out of character with the appearance of the building and row of traditional cottages because of its form, design, use of glazing and degree of projection from the main elevation into the front garden. There is some screening of the porch from vegetation and by the large garage, however it is prominent as a discordant feature when viewed from the footway at Station Road and from the gardens of the neighbouring cottages.

6. I find that the porch has a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the dwelling, cottages and street scene. It therefore conflicts with policy ENV1 of the East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document regarding the integration of high-quality design, in particular, part B(1) which seeks to ensure regard to the specifics of a site's wider context and the character of the surrounding area and part B(3) requiring development of appropriate scale, massing, height, and materials. It would also conflict with the objectives of the National Design Guide and paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of its context, building type, design, and form.

Flood risk

7. The Council's reasons for refusal included that the site is within Flood Zone 2 which means that there is a medium risk of flooding and that the floor levels of the extension appear to be lower than those in the main building, potentially placing that part of the dwelling in a more vulnerable flood risk situation. No flood risk assessment has been submitted by the appellant and no supporting information has been provided to indicate that extra flood resistance and resilience measures have been incorporated in the extension. I find that it has not been demonstrated that the extension will be safe for its lifetime. Therefore, the development conflicts with policy ENV6 of the East Riding Local Plan and guidance in paragraph 159 of the Framework regarding development in areas at risk from flooding.

Conclusion

8. I have taken all other matters raised into account. I acknowledge that the appellant values the space provided by the extension and note that he acted on advice regarding the planning requirements. However, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR