



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2023

by K Mansell BA (Hons) MPhil TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/23/3327930

4 Mill Lane, Kirk Ella, East Riding of Yorkshire HU10 7QY

- 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 Mrs Dymond against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref 22/04039/PLF, dated 14 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as 'proposed loft conversion'.
-

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 host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property at 4 Mill Lane is a two-storey semi-detached house that forms a pair with No 2. From the street, there is a regularity to their design, reflected in the mirrored use of red brick and render with mock Tudor detailing. A sense of visual symmetry is also created by the double height bay windows to each house and the original hipped roof, divided by a central chimney stack. This has been modified on the appeal site by an earlier two-storey side extension. No 4 has also been previously extended to the rear at ground and first floor level.
4. The appeal proposal would introduce a rear dormer window, positioned just above the existing eaves of the dwelling. It would include a second storey projecting gable above an existing gable projection, as well as an increase to the ridge height of part of the existing roof. This would facilitate the conversion of the loft to living space.
5. During the processing of the application, I am mindful that the Council indicated to the appellant that the removal of the rear facing gable might address a concern it had about the scale of the roof works. However, no revisions to the submitted plans were subsequently made. Whilst noting the comparisons provided by the appellant between the determined scheme and the alternative proffered by the Council, and even if this amendment implied support for the rear dormer element of the scheme, my decision must be based on the plans upon which the Council made its decision, as originally submitted.

6. The rear dormer window would be constructed to the width of the main house. Combined with the gable projection that would extend beyond its main rear wall, and the vertical fenestration treatment to both elements, the rear elevation of the property would consequently appear to be three storeys in scale. The proposal would therefore add significant bulk and massing to the house.
7. Furthermore, it would dominate the original roof form and it would be neither subordinate or sympathetic to the scale and form of the original two-storey dwelling. It would change the character and appearance of the host dwelling and represent an incongruous addition as a result. Even the use of a plain hanging tile to the dormer and matching roof tiles would not mitigate the harm, as it would still appear as a dominant addition to the host dwelling irrespective of the materials used.
8. From Mill Lane, the front roof profile of the appeal property has already been altered by the previous two-storey side extension. However, the roof to this addition is set down from the main ridgeline and the original hipped roof form of the house is still evident. Furthermore, the existing length of the ridgeline from the chimney stack to No 4 is mirrored on the adjacent dwelling at No.2. This provides a degree of symmetry between the two and reflects the prevailing hipped roof profile that is evident on dwellings within the immediate locality.
9. Whilst the appeal proposal would be no higher than the existing ridge height of the house, it would nevertheless increase the height of a part of the roof. From the street, it would read as an extended ridge line from the chimney. This would visually unbalance the roof profile of the pair of dwellings and, being visible from the road, it would appear discordant as a result, to the detriment of the streetscene.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy ENV1 of the East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document 2012-2029 (April 2016). This policy seeks to secure high-quality design and to ensure, amongst other matters, that development has regard to the site's wider character and context and is of an appropriate scale and massing. It would further conflict with guidance at Paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which promotes the importance of good design, and additional guidance at Parts C1, C2, I1, I2, B1 and B2 of the National Design Guide. These sections broadly seek to ensure that development is well-designed, relates well to the site and responds positively to context, identity and place.

Other Matters

11. I appreciate that the works would facilitate the conversion of the loft to provide the appellant with additional living accommodation. However, such personal circumstances do not, in my view, outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Mansell

INSPECTOR