



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2014

by Graham M Garnham BA BPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 12 September 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2736/D/14/2223337

Rowan Cottage, Great Habton, Malton, North Yorkshire, YO17 6TU

- 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 Iain Rookes against the decision of Ryedale District Council.
 - The application Ref 14/00630/HOUSE was refused by notice dated 8 July 2014.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I consider that this is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a small semi-detached bungalow. There is a bedroom and bathroom upstairs, lit by rooflights at the front and a dormer window at the rear. There is what appears to be a later extension against the outer side wall, with a garage at the front and a small bedroom at the rear. The other half of the pair, Holly Cottage, has a conservatory at the rear, but appears to be largely unchanged at the front.
 4. The proposed extension would retain the garage and have a study at the rear. There would be two bedrooms and a shower room above. Added headroom would be achieved with a dormer window at the front and a gable form at the rear. The extension would be a little wider and further forward than the existing footprint. I consider that it would nonetheless be a significant enlargement in terms of volume and internal floorspace.
 5. The original design of the building has a distinct layout, focused on a central protruding gable feature. This has a pitched roof, the ridge of which is on the boundary line between the two dwellings. Front doors into the respective halls are on the side walls of this feature, which has matching windows in an unusual
-

inverted 'L' shape on the front face. This strongly symmetrical form, and the small size of the building as a whole, gives an initial impression that it may be just one detached bungalow, rather than a pair. As a consequence, I consider that particular care is needed with the scale and form of any lateral extension, if it is positively to reflect its context. This is required by policies SP16 & SP20 in the Ryedale Plan – Local Plan Strategy (2013).

6. I estimate from the drawings that the extension would add about 50% to the width of the original dwelling. I consider that it would be set back from the main front face by an insufficient amount to create an adequate perception of subservience. This effect would be compounded by the ridge being only slightly lower than the main roof. The front dormer would have a catslide form, and occupy around two thirds of the width and depth of the roof slope. This is a type of dormer I did not observe elsewhere in the village. I consider that its size in relation to the roof slope and its unusual form would be likely to draw the eye further to what would appear to be a large scale addition to the host property, that would unbalance the unified design and appearance of the pair significantly more than the existing smaller scale, flat-roofed addition.
 7. The resultant end gable wall would contain the largest expanse of flat brickwork on the entire building. It would be the first built form to be seen on this side of the road when entering the village from the west, and would be clearly evident from in front of the building. I consider that this would reinforce the prominence of the extension in, and its negative effect upon, the local street scene. However, views of the rear would be limited to nearby private gardens and adjoining fields, where I consider that it would have an acceptable impact on local character and appearance.
 8. The existing building is quite unusual within the main part of the village that I observed from the through roads. The dwellings I saw generally had plain front faces, and were of simple gable-ended forms without significant extensions. Dormer windows were small with pitched roofs, some set below the eaves line to reduce their visual impact. Variety is not necessarily to be discouraged, but I consider that the scale and form of the proposal would have a negative effect on the quality of the building of which the appeal property is part. It would thus detract from rather than enrich the local street scene.
 9. I conclude that the proposal would materially harm the character and appearance of the building and the street scene, and thereby fall short with respect to the local plan policies referred to above. I consider that these shortcomings could not be overcome by the use of additional planting in the front garden, or be offset by the larger width of the plot compared to that of Holly Cottage. The design would not meet the standards now set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.
10. Planning permission should therefore be withheld and I dismiss the appeal.

G Garnham

INSPECTOR