



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 2020

by Alison Partington BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C2741/D/19/3243972

24 Maythorn Road, Huntington, York YO31 9DL

- 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 Chris Young against the decision of City of York Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01182/FUL, dated 1 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as "Removal of south boundary fence and timber stores sheds behind plus raised decking below. To construct a "secure" brick store with mono pitched tiled roof. Remote controlled front access roll up and over shutter. Rear single access door with side window from rear courtyard /garden planting area. High boundary fences to be reinstated where removed for new build. Store use to hold bikes, tools, household / garden equipment etc. The new build will include a covered passage adjacent to the existing house wall."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The reason for refusal refers to Policies GP1 and H7 of the *City of York Draft Local Plan Incorporating the 4th set of changes; Development Control Local Plan* (DCLP). I understand the DCLP was approved by the Council for development control purposes in April 2005. Whilst this is not a development plan the policies referred to are in line with the Framework and so I have had regard to them as a material consideration.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached house located on the junction of Maythorn Road and Thornfield Drive. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, comprising mainly semi-detached houses and bungalows. Building lines in the area are strong, with properties on corner plots generally respecting the building lines on both streets. This, together with the modest front gardens gives the area a typically open and spacious suburban character.
5. Detailed guidance on house extensions is provided in the *House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (approved December 2012)* (SPD). This indicates that side extensions should be sensitively designed so that they do not erode the open space within the street and do not project

- beyond clearly defined building lines. In addition, it states that unduly wide side extensions should be avoided and that they should not normally be more than 50% of the width of the original house.
6. The property already has a two storey side extension whose width is almost the same as the width of the original dwelling. The appeal scheme proposes to erect a single storey extension at the side of this. The proposed extension would be set back slightly from the front elevation of the existing extension and would occupy the remainder of the space between the house and the boundary with Thornfield Drive. Whilst the width of the proposed extension may only be limited, the cumulative width of the two extensions is far greater than that of the original house. As a result, the original property would be dominated by both the proposed and existing extensions rather than them being sympathetic and subservient additions to it.
 7. As the extension would occupy the remaining open land at the side of the dwelling, it would result in the erosion of the open space between the dwelling and side boundary which is a characteristic feature of corner plots in the area. As a result, it would create a sense of enclosure at this junction that would be out of keeping with the wider area.
 8. Whilst the height of the extension is limited, it would still be higher than the existing boundary fence and clearly visible to passers-by. As the existing extension already breaks the strong building line on Thornfield Drive, this further addition would exacerbate this situation, resulting in the dwelling being an overly dominant feature in the street scene, particularly in views along Thornfield Drive.
 9. Consequently, I consider that the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policies GP1 and H7 of the DCLP which require that developments in general, and house extensions in particular, are sympathetic and compatible with the host property and the locality and avoid the loss of gaps that contribute to the quality of the local environment.
 10. I note the personal circumstances of the appellant and his family that result in a desire for extra storage space. However, personal circumstances seldom outweigh more general planning considerations, and it is likely that the extension would remain long after the current personal circumstances cease to be material.
 11. In support of the appeal my attention was drawn to two other similar single storey side extensions on corner properties that have been approved in the area. However, I do not have the full details of the circumstances that led to either of these being accepted, nor the character and appearance of the area in which they are located. Moreover, from the photos provided it would appear that neither house already had a side extension, and so their circumstances are not directly comparable to the appeal scheme. I have, in any case, determined the proposal on its own merits.
 12. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Alison Partington

INSPECTOR