



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 April 2024

by J Smith MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29.05.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/W/23/3334612

**Applewood, 12 Grosvenor Place, East Riding of Yorkshire, Beverley
HU17 8LY**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Charles Ward of Ward Homes Yorkshire against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 22/04034/PLF.
 - The development proposed is residential development to build 2 no. houses and 1 no. bungalow with garages and parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. As the proposal is located in a conservation area I have had special regard to Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would conserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Grosvenor Place Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within the Grosvenor Place Conservation Area (CA). Grosvenor Place is a short, narrow cul-de-sac on the outskirts of Beverley. The road is flanked by mid-19th century workers cottages, which opens up at the end of the street, giving it a tunnel like appearance. This area at the end of the street was previously an orchard but is now occupied by houses built in the 20th century which are set further back from the road. This post World War II development has ignored the fundamental characteristic of the street which is derived from its narrow width and intimate relationship between the road and its buildings. The area's significance derives from this unique and historic street scene, and its more open area at the southern end. This is also important as part of the approach to the wider setting of the town and its historic core.
5. The appeal site comprises a bungalow constructed in the 1960s. This dwelling is located in a generously proportioned site. This garden is part of the open space in this part of the CA and therefore makes a positive contribution to its significance.

6. The Council consider the demolition of the existing building and ancillary pool building would not cause harm to the character or appearance of the CA and would therefore be acceptable. I find no reason to disagree.
7. The proposal would sub-divide the plot and replace the existing bungalow with three well sized dwellings with two house types. They would be sited in a linear pattern, behind the established building line along Grosvenor Place.
8. These generously proportioned dwellings would be sited in close proximity to each other, with limited space between and around each building. They would have a contemporary appearance through the use of tall elevations, flat roof forms to the front and rear and large modern window features. These features would appear alien in the surrounding context. The use of an appropriate palette of materials would not diminish this harm. Collectively, these aspects would enclose this open area of Grosvenor Place, which would be detrimental to the CA.
9. Furthermore, when viewed from the Westwood, the informality of the building features within the CA provides gaps and visual breaks which add depth when observed from this viewpoint. Despite the proposed size of the rear garden spaces which would assist in providing some depth to the site, the proposed buildings at close proximity to each other would appear as a substantial and cramped collection of buildings.
10. Existing trees on the approach to Beverley and surrounding the appeal site, including the additional trees proposed, would help to mitigate the visual impact of the proposal. However, this benefit would be limited when viewed from the Westwood and would not diminish the harm caused by the loss of openness to this part of the CA. As such, the proposal would remove the openness currently experienced at this end of the CA when viewed from the Westwood on approach into Beverley.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be an incongruous and cramped form of development which would fail to integrate effectively with the existing built development on Grosvenor Place and would harmfully erode the open and spacious area which characterises the southern end of the CA. The proposal would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA and would conflict with Policies A1, ENV1 and ENV3 of the East Riding Local Plan Strategy Document 2016. These policies seek for proposals to ensure the safeguarding of the historic environment through their design, layout, scale, density, massing and height. These policies also require the protection of elements which contribute to the character of heritage assets, including elements such as key views of conservation areas.

Heritage Balance

12. In terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) the harm I have identified would be less than substantial, and I am therefore required by paragraph 208 to weigh this harm against the public benefits of the scheme.
13. The Framework promotes and supports the boost of the supply of housing. The proposal would provide three additional family sized homes, including lifetime homes. The proposal would generate jobs during the construction period and future occupiers would use local shops and services and generate Council tax receipts. The social and economic benefits are factors in the scheme's favour

which carry moderate weight in my assessment. The inclusion of energy efficiency measures within the homes and the provision of a turning head at the end of Grosvenor Place to assist vehicles manoeuvring in this narrow street and would be public benefits of limited weight.

14. The Heritage Statement suggests that there is a low potential for archaeological interest at the appeal site. A condition was suggested to undertake an archaeological survey or monitoring of the site during construction. Recording any archaeological interest on the site would be a requirement of the development plan, and is therefore a neutral factor in the balance.
15. I am required to give considerable importance and weight to any harm to a designated heritage asset, which the Framework states should be conserved in accordance with their significance. The moderate and limited public benefits associated with the provision of three dwellings would not outweigh the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the CA. The proposal is therefore unacceptable.

Other Matters

16. I acknowledge the concerns raised by local residents in relation to living conditions, trees, flood risk and traffic. However, none of these have been determining matters in my assessment of this appeal.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and the provisions of the Framework. There are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

J Smith

INSPECTOR