
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2016

by David Cross BA (Hons), PGDip, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 2 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2736/D/16/3159383
12 Elm Grove, Sherburn, Malton YO17 8PF

- 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 A Oldroyd against the decision of Ryedale District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01121/HOUSE, dated 5 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of a part side & rear two storey extension & linked with a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is part of a modern housing estate which consists of dwellings of varying design. The proposal consists of a two storey extension to the side and rear of the property as well as a single storey extension to the rear. The dwelling is set forward of the neighbouring property of 10 Elm Grove, which would mean the two storey side extension would be readily visible in views from the highway, particularly when approaching the site from the west.
 4. The pitched roof of the two storey extension would have a different orientation than the host dwelling and the neighbouring property of No 10 and would therefore not sit comfortably in relation to either building. Furthermore, the location of the two storey element of the extension towards the rear of the side elevation of the host dwelling would mean that the extension would appear as an incongruous addition wrapped around the corner of the building. The open fronted passageway under the extension would add to the ungainly appearance of the proposal. Whilst the extension is subservient to the host dwelling, it would be intrusive in views from the street due to its height, design and the layout of the site.
 5. In support of the proposal, the appellants have referred to an extension at 20 Field View, Norton which they state is similar to the appeal proposal and is set within a similar context. However, based on the plans provided to me and my
-

observations on site, the extension at No 20 uses a different roof design and is of a different footprint to the appeal proposal. In my view, the extension at No 20 is more sympathetic to the original dwelling and sits more comfortably within the wider street scene. The circumstances that apply to No 20 are therefore not directly comparable to the development before me.

6. I have had regard to the concerns raised locally in relation to loss of view, overshadowing, loss of light, access during construction, impact on property values and loss of privacy. However, they do not add to my reasons for dismissing this appeal.
7. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies SP16 and SP20 of the Ryedale Plan - Local Plan Strategy 2013 which require extensions to existing buildings to be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the host building and the context of the immediate locality. These policies are broadly consistent with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of securing good design.
8. For the reasons stated above, and with regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR