



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2016

by Roy Merrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/C2741/D/16/3156055
228 Bishopthorpe Road, York YO23 1LG

- 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 and Mrs Sean Stick against the decision of City of York Council.
 - The application Ref 15/02920/FUL, dated 23 December 2015, was refused by notice dated 17 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing garage and outbuildings and erection of two storey side extension to form new garage and additional living and bedroom accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the original dwelling and street scene.

Reasons

3. The part of Bishopthorpe Road in which the appeal site is located is characterised by a predominance of two storey terraced dwellings in contrasting brick colours, with projecting bay windows and traditional pitched roofs. The repetition of design detail results in a sense of visual rhythm along the street. The appeal dwelling with its detached form, hipped roof and single storey extension to the side is not therefore, typical of the above character.
 4. Though the extension would be set back from the main forward projecting element of the building frontage, it would be greater in width. In addition, its flat roof design, whilst helping to reduce mass and dominance, would appear at odds with the hipped roof of the dwelling and the gable end of the adjacent terrace.
 5. Despite some consistency with the original dwelling in terms of the proportions and horizontal alignment of the front elevation window frames, the strong use of regular lines and resulting square and rectangular forms, would give the extension a contemporary appearance, very different to that of the main dwelling and terrace.
-

6. Furthermore, the proposed use of timber cladding and blue brickwork, though the latter is present in small quantities around the base of the original dwelling, would not be characteristic materials in the wider street scene.
7. Therefore, drawing the above considerations together, the form and appearance of the proposal would lack subservience to the main dwelling. Whilst the original dwelling itself departs from the prevailing character in the street scene as referred to above, the extension would visually jar both with it and with the adjacent terrace. In so doing it would appear incongruous with its surroundings and would draw attention to the interruption in visual rhythm along the street scene. I do not therefore agree with the appellant that the extension would represent a transition from the hipped roof of the parent dwelling to the gable of the terrace.
8. I acknowledge that the existing prominent side extension including garage, which relates poorly to the main dwelling, would be removed. The proposal would also help to screen, to a degree, views of the extensive gable elevation to No 230 Bishopthorpe Road, when viewed from Beresford Terrace. However these factors, along with the explanation that the design has partly been informed by the physical constraints of the plot and the desire to maintain vertical emphasis in the street scene, do not justify the harm I have identified above.
9. I have taken into account that the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) clearly states that decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and should not stifle innovation. Nevertheless the Framework goes on to state that it is proper to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.
10. In this case the proposed extension would introduce a form of architecture that would be alien to the character of the street scene and in my view would go beyond acceptable innovation. I conclude that it would result in harm to the character and appearance of the original dwelling and street scene. Accordingly it would fail to reinforce local distinctiveness and in this regard would be in conflict with the Framework. I must give significant weight to this consideration in my decision.
11. The proposal would also be in conflict with Policies GP1 and H7 of the City of York Draft Local Plan 2005 and the Council's Draft Supplementary Planning Document – House Extensions and Alterations 2012 insofar as they seek to promote good design, compatible with neighbouring buildings and the character of the area. This adds to the weight against allowing the appeal.

Conclusion

12. I therefore conclude, having had regard to all other matters raised, including that there has been a letter in support of the proposal, that the appeal should be dismissed.

Roy Merrett

INSPECTOR