



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2025

by J Hockley BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/24/3355694

5 Bleak House Farm Cottages, Patrington Road, Sunk Island, East Yorkshire, HU12 0QL

- 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 D Hunt against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application ref is 24/02342/PLF.
 - The development proposed is described as 'an extension to existing domestic outbuildings (re-submission of 24/01490/PLF)'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. On 2 April 2025 East Riding of Yorkshire Council adopted the East Riding Local Plan Update. Both parties were given the opportunity to make comments on this change to the development plan.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development upon the setting of the Grade II listed 5 Bleak House Farm Cottage and upon the character and appearance of the Sunk Island Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. 4-5 Bleak House Farm Cottages are an attractive Grade II listed pair of semi-detached houses. The 2 storey properties, designed by SS Teulon and stated in the listing to date from 1855, are constructed in red brick with a hipped slate roof. Details include windows with soldier arches and a noticeable small side window with pointed head. No 5 has a distinctive chamfered corner.
5. The listed buildings occupy a prominent location in the local landscape, being sited at the junction of Patrington Road and a private road heading to Bleak House Farm. No 5 is the northern house of the pair and is located next to Patrington Road and is therefore more visually prominent than its neighbour.
6. Sunk Island Conservation Area (the CA) is characterised by its flat landscape and wide-open views and skies. The area is the result of direct land reclamation, by draining the land between the original island and the previous mainland. The flat, open landscape is scattered with isolated cottages and farmsteads and views and vistas are widespread and long reaching. As a result existing development is often

fairly prominent in the landscape, as is the case for the listed building in this appeal.

7. The Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires special regard to be given to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting. Section 72(1) of the same Act states that special attention must be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.
8. Paragraph 205 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) says when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset (including conservation areas), great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Significance can be harmed or lost by development within its setting (paragraph 206).
9. The special interest and significance of No 5 Bleak Farm Cottages arises from its historical interest as part of a pair of simply but well designed purpose built properties and its setting within the wider Sunk Island, reflecting the history of the area and its reclamation from the sea.
10. To the rear of the properties lie a red brick outbuilding, also with a hipped and tiled roof, which spans the rear gardens of the two houses and is split in two. There is then a gap and then a smaller outbuilding, also spanning the boundary of the house's gardens, which has a catslide roof angled to the east. The more substantial outbuilding is significantly older than the small one and is noted by the Council to date from at least 1880. This larger outbuilding adds to the setting of the listed building, with its largely symmetrical nature in respect to the neighbouring cottages and simple quality of its design enhancing the setting of the listed building and adding to the character and appearance of the CA.
11. The proposal seeks to construct a further outbuilding to effectively fill this gap between the outbuildings. The proposed structure would be for garaging/covered parking, constructed in reclaimed bricks with a red pantiled hipped roof. The roof ridge would be of a very similar height to that of the larger outbuilding and the northern boundary of the outbuilding would protrude beyond that of the existing larger outbuilding.
12. In filling the gap between the outbuildings, and in providing a structure of roughly the same height as the historic outbuilding and one which would extend further to the north than this existing building, the proposal would draw the eye away from and detract from the character of this outbuilding and adversely affect the setting of the listed building. In turn this would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the CA. While the design would be different and hence three outbuildings would still be visible and distinct, given the matching height and extension to the north the proposal would adversely affect the historic outbuilding by filling the gap between and visually merging the existing outbuildings in some respects.
13. I note that the existing outbuildings are not fully symmetrical at present, and that the width of the proposed covered parking is to make the area "fit for purpose". I also noted on site the existing side extensions to no 5, which are not symmetrical, and the replacement windows to this property. However, I do not consider that the existence of such factors and features lessens the effect that the proposed outbuilding would have, which would still cause harm via the filling of the gap and

due to the size and scale of the outbuilding. I also note the appellant's proposed materials, which would match existing and be appropriate for the site. However, this would not outweigh the harm that the scale and massing of the building would cause.

14. As the proposal would only affect the setting of the listed building, I consider that such harm is less than substantial. I conclude nevertheless that the proposal would fail to preserve the special interest of the building, and that in doing so also fails to preserve the historic character and appearance of the CA. Paragraph 202 of the Framework states that where less than substantial harm is caused, this should be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme. The proposal would clearly provide a useful and valued space for the appellant, but such benefits are private. As such, public benefits do not outweigh the clear harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

15. I conclude that the proposed outbuilding would have an adverse effect on the setting of Grade II listed No 5 Bleak House Cottages; nor would it preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Such harm would be less than substantial but the public benefits of the development would not outweigh such harm. As such the scheme conflicts with the Framework.
16. The proposed outbuilding also conflicts with policies ENV1 and ENV3 of the East Riding Local Plan Update (April 2025) which, when read together, state that all development will be supported where it achieves a high quality of design, having an appropriate scale, massing and height and that proposals that will cause harm to the significance of a heritage asset will only be granted where clear and convincing justification for the harm can be demonstrated.
17. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Hockley

INSPECTOR