



Appeal Decision

by Graeme Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 14 May 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/N2739/D/20/3246473

1 Park Avenue, Barlow, Selby North Yorkshire YO8 8LE

- 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 Mark Warren against the decision of Selby District Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/1115/HPA, dated 28 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is demolition of single storey outbuilding and erection of 2 storey extension to side of existing semi-detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of single storey outbuilding and erection of 2 storey extension to side of existing semi-detached dwelling at 1 Park Avenue, Barlow, Selby North Yorkshire YO8 8LE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2019/1115/HPA, dated 28 October 2019, 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: Dwg 191018 1 Dwelling as existing and DWG 191018 2 a Dwelling as proposed.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. In response to travel restrictions currently in place due to the COVID-19 pandemic I consider that this appeal can be determined without the need for a physical site visit. This is because I have been able to reach a decision based on the information already available, supplemented by additional evidence supplied by the appellant and confirmed as being accurate by the Council. Both the appellant and the Council have been given an opportunity to provide comments on this approach and I have taken any responses into account.
3. The appellant has highlighted reference to the 'Cawood Conservation Area' in the Council's delegated report. The reason for refusal makes no reference to the effect of the proposal on the character or appearance of any Conservation Area, be it Cawood, Barlow or elsewhere. I have not been provided with any further evidence regarding the existence of a Conservation Area in Barlow, nor has it been argued further that the appeal site lies within any such area. On this basis, I have determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is located on an open and prominent corner at the entrance to Park Avenue from Carr Lane. Although I have not been able to visit the site for the reasons explained above, 'StreetView' images and the originally submitted evidence, together with that additionally requested and provided, demonstrates that although Park Avenue is residential in character and comprised of mainly semi-detached dwellings, there is no single defining architectural style present. As a consequence, the appearance of properties varies in terms of scale, form, age and whether or not they've been extended.
6. I have noted that the appellant reduced the width of the proposed extension during the Council's consideration of the proposal but, despite this amendment, the Council remained concerned that the extension would still be too wide and dominant. I, however, disagree.
7. The shallow windows and width of the façade of this pair of dwellings imbue the semi-detached pair with a strong horizontal emphasis. On the small pockets of similar dwellings elsewhere along Park Avenue, similar proportions and characteristics are also present on those dwellings, regardless of whether they have previously been extended or not. The proposed extension would reflect this horizontal emphasis and respect one of the varied characteristics present within the street.
8. Furthermore, the set down of the roof ridge and set back of the extension's facade would ensure that the extension would not overpower the scale or proportions of the host property. In this respect, the proposed extension would be a proportionate addition to No. 1 without overpowering it, and one that would reflect the character and proportions of not just the host property, but also the pair of properties when viewed together.
9. The appeal property is situated within a large corner plot site. Up to date photographic evidence submitted during the course of the appeal, the accuracy of which the Council have confirmed, show that the appeal site is open despite a substantial timber fence around the garden plot's perimeter. The side extension would retain space around its corner and flank and, with open countryside beyond and the rural lane of Carr Lane to the side, the openness of the entrance to Park Lane would not be materially harmed.
10. Selby District Core Strategy (SDCS) policy SP19 and Selby District Local Plan (SDLP) saved policy ENV1 both seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of development, respectively. Regard, they state, should be had to local character and context, and proposals should contribute positively to an area's identity through scale, density and layout and take account of the character of the area. Neither refer to side extensions having to remain subordinate to the main house and nor have I been referred to any policy or guidance which refers to extensions being no more than half the width of the frontage so as to remain subservient.
11. For the reasons I have set out above, the proposed extension would clearly read as a distinct, yet subservient, addition to No. 1 whilst respecting the style,

proportions and character of the host building. These are factors which SDCS policy SP19 and SDLP policy ENV1 seek to secure in development proposals and with which the proposal would align. Nor, for the same reasons, would the proposal be contrary to the provisions, aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in seeking to secure good design.

Conditions

12. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in light of the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. The three conditions suggested by the Council, relating to time limit, plans and materials conditions are necessary and reasonable and I have adopted those, with the addition of the drawing numbers in the plans condition. No further conditions have been suggested and I have no reason to impose any additional conditions.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Graeme Robbie

INSPECTOR