

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 July 2017

by M Seaton BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C2741/D/17/3171171

4 Minster Close, Wigginton, York, YO32 2GP

- 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 Paul Waines against the decision of City of York Council.
 - The application Ref 16/02556/FUL, dated 3 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is first floor rear extensions including an increase in the size of existing dormer window.
-

Procedural Matter

1. There is a certain degree of variation between the appellant and the Council in the description of the proposed development. Whilst the appellant has set out an extensive description of development, I note that the Council has adopted a far more concise description of the proposals. However, the essence of the description of development is the same and I am satisfied that the more concise version would suffice in this instance.

Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the streetscene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached dormer-style dwelling, set within a group of similar properties in a largely residential area. The wider area is characterised by a mix of single-storey and two-storey dwellings of a variety of scale and designs. The appeal property has a semi-detached single storey garage set within the rear garden on the boundary with No. 2 Minster Close.
 5. The proposed rear extensions have been subject to revision during the course of the planning application, with the final revisions upon which the Council based their decision, having the effect of reducing the length of the first floor rear extension and introducing a pitched roof, as well as reducing the depth of the dormer element.
 6. Whilst I am satisfied that the revised scheme in itself is an overall improvement in design terms from the originally proposed flat roof extension, I find that the
-

juxtaposition between the proposed pitched roof element and existing flat roof rear dormer, would result in an awkward junction between the two roof forms. I consider that this would be to the visual detriment of the character and appearance of the property. Furthermore, whilst I am mindful of the appellant's need for a certain level of additional floorspace, and also that the extension has been reduced in size and would be set down from the ridge height, I am nevertheless not persuaded that the overall scale and bulk of the extensions would appear subservient in design to the comparatively modest-sized host dwelling, and I agree that the resultant dwelling would appear 'top-heavy'.

7. Turning to the impact of the proposed extensions on the street scene, I am satisfied that any adverse impact on Minster Close itself as a consequence of the visibility of the extension through the principal vantage point between Nos. 2 & 4 Minster Close, would be restricted due to the relatively limited gap between the properties. However, the bulk and extent of the proposed rear extension would be readily visible across neighbouring rear gardens from the public realm on Kirkcroft to the south-west, and I am satisfied that from this vantage point, the rear extension would appear as an incongruous addition to the dwelling, which would significantly unbalance the semi-detached pair.
8. The appellant has referred me to a number of other properties within Wigginton and the surrounding area, which it is contended have benefitted from either a similar design or scale of extension. I have considered the submissions on this matter, and noted the form of the extensions and design of host dwellings referred to. However, whilst I accept that there are some similarities in either the form of the host dwelling and extension, or the scale of the extension, I do not have any details before me regarding the age of the extensions, whether planning permission was granted, and if so how the decision-making process informed any eventual consent. I am also mindful that each planning application must be treated on its own individual merits, and I do not therefore consider that the examples highlighted set a precedent which would be desirable to replicate given the character of the dwelling and wider area.
9. I am satisfied that the scale and bulk of the proposed rear extension would result in an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and the area. The proposal therefore conflicts with Saved Policies GP1 and H7 of the City of York Draft Development Control Local Plan (2005), and design guidance set out in paragraphs 7.1, 7.2, 7.4, 14.4 & 14.5 of the City of York Supplementary Planning Document Draft, "Housing Extensions and Alterations" (2012). Whilst these policies are not part of the Development Plan, they are material considerations, and set out the need for extensions and alterations to existing dwellings to be of a subservient design compatible with the main dwelling and the character of the area, and for roof forms to reflect the style of the existing dwelling. Furthermore, the proposal would not accord with paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) as it would not represent high quality design.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

M Seaton

INSPECTOR