

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2016

**by Helen Cassini BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 07 November 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y2736/D/16/3155177**

**1 Sycamore Cottage, Cawton Road, Gilling East, Helmsley YO62 4JG**

- 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 & Mrs D Guy against the decision of Ryedale District Council.
  - The application Ref 16/00658/HOUSE, dated 6 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 June 2016.
  - The development proposed is a first floor alteration to provide 2 No new dormers to the front elevation of the property.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor alteration to provide 2 No new dormers to the front elevation of the property at 1 Sycamore Cottage, Cawton Road, Gilling East, Helmsley YO62 4JG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/00658/HOUSE, dated 6 April 2016, subject to the following conditions:
  - (1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - (2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan Drawing No. 004, Existing and Proposed Site Plan Drawing No. 404 Revision A, Existing Elevations Drawing No. 003 Revision C, Existing Ground Floor Plan Drawing No. 001 Revision C, Existing First Floor Plan Drawing No. 002 Revision C, Proposed Elevations Drawing No. 403 Revision A, Proposed Ground Floor Drawing No 401 Revision A, Proposed First Floor Drawing No. 402 Revision A, Proposed Dormer Details Drawing No. 405.
  - (3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

### Reasons

3. The host dwelling is a two storey semi-detached cottage, located on a corner plot at the junction of Cawton Road and Station Road/Main Street. Given the
-

- relatively prominent corner location, the host dwelling is readily visible within the public realm.
4. The host dwelling, and the adjoining Rose Cottage on the eastern elevation, are both constructed from stone with slate roofs. However, Rose Cottage has both a considerably narrower frontage and also two dormer windows at first floor level. From the evidence before me, I acknowledge that these dormer windows are unlikely to be original features, although the Council does not have records confirming the date of their installation.
  5. I also note that the host dwelling has been subject to a number of planning applications and more recently a planning appeal<sup>1</sup> in respect of two schemes relating to a ground floor alteration and extension and first floor extension to the rear of the dwelling, including a dormer window.
  6. The proposed dormer windows would result in an undoubted increase in bulk, and would subsequently alter the appearance and disposition of the roof form. I note the Council's concerns regarding the loss of the two existing first floor windows and the introduction of a vertical element to what is a linear cottage. However, I am satisfied that the overall scale, design and use of matching materials would ensure that the dormer windows would appear appropriate in the context of the design of the dwelling.
  7. Furthermore, I also acknowledge the concern of the Council in respect of the prominence of the front elevation in the wider street scene and their contention that the dormers would be highly visible. I accept that the proposal would be visible from Cawton Road and when approaching the dwelling on Station Road and Main Street. However, given the proposed scale and position on the roof slope, I am satisfied that they would neither appear as an inappropriate or incongruous features in the context of the dwelling. As such, I do not consider that they would represent an obtrusive or disruptive feature within the street scene or wider area.
  8. In addition there is currently a lack of rhythm and consistency in relation to both the host dwelling and Rose Cottage. I accept that neither the existing dormers on Rose Cottage or the proposal before me represent original features. However, the introduction of the proposed dormer windows would remove the current imbalance and the group value of the cottages would be significantly increased.
  9. From my site visit it was also evident that a number of dormer windows in the vicinity of the appeal site exist. As such, I consider dormer windows to be a design feature which has been successfully incorporated within the wider area to dwellings with a mix of architectural styles. I also note that whilst there is a degree of variation in the design approach to other existing dormer windows, any such differences do not detract from the visual interest or appearance of the dwellings.
  10. The host dwelling is located within the Howardian Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (the AONB). Policy SP13 of The Ryedale Plan – Local Plan Strategy 2013 (the LP) states that proposals will only be supported where they do not detract from the natural beauty and special qualities of these naturally protected landscapes or their settings. In their submitted evidence the Council

---

<sup>1</sup> Appeal reference APP/Y2736/D/15/3128997

confirms that as a result of the host dwelling being sited within the Gilling East development limits and the scale of the proposal, they do not consider that the natural beauty and special qualities of the AONB would be adversely affected. I have nothing before me which leads me to disagree with this view and I therefore find that the proposal does not conflict with the Policy SP13 of the LP.

11. Accordingly, on the basis of the evidence submitted and from my own observations, I am not satisfied that the proposal would result in an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling. I do not therefore find any conflict with Policies SP16 and SP20 of the LP and paragraphs 56 to 68 of the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of good design. Taken together these policies and guidance, amongst other things, seek to ensure that residential extensions respect the character of both the host dwelling and wider area, through high quality design which reflects local distinctiveness.

### **Conditions**

12. The Council has suggested a number of conditions which it considers would be appropriate were the appeal to be allowed. I have considered these in light of both the Framework and Planning Policy Guidance and find them all to be reasonable and necessary in the circumstances of this case.
13. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans in order to provide certainty. In order to ensure a high quality development, a condition relating to the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the proposal is also necessary.

### **Conclusion**

14. I therefore conclude that, subject to appropriate conditions, the appeal should be allowed.

*Helen Cassini*

INSPECTOR