
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2020 by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C2708/D/20/3262106

22 Park Crescent, Hellifield, Skipton BD23 4HD

- 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 Macaulay against the decision of Craven District Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/21675/HH, dated 23 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey extension to the rear of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The effect of the proposed development on:
 - (i) The living conditions of occupiers of No 22 Park Crescent, with particular regard to garden provision, and
 - (ii) The character and appearance of the appeal site.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 2 storey semi-detached dwelling within a predominantly residential area. The appeal site is wedge shaped, thus the rear garden is limited in size and narrows into a point.

Living conditions

5. The extension would take up much of the useable external space to the rear of the dwelling. The resultant private rear garden area would be of an extremely restricted width and depth and would not provide a reasonably-sized, useable area for use by a family.
6. The appellant states that on completion of the extension the existing shed in the rear garden would be removed. Nevertheless, the proposed extension would still dominate the garden, leaving only a narrow strip to the rear which would be an unattractive and unusable space for occupiers.

7. The dwelling has a good-sized side garden and a grassed area to the front. Both are bounded by low fences and there is a distinct lack of boundary landscaping. As such, both of these areas are highly visible to passers-by. It is acknowledged that the appellant considers the front and side garden spaces to be less overlooked than the rear garden. However, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, I must also consider the living conditions of future occupiers of the appeal property. Therefore, whilst these parts of the garden may provide space for a family to use, they do not have good levels of privacy and thus I do not consider that they would provide high-quality external space for future occupiers.
8. Moreover, even if I found that the side garden would provide good quality external space for occupiers, I note that the host dwelling has extant planning permission for a two-storey side extension. Whilst I do not have the full details before me, it nevertheless raises significant concern in my mind that the amount of garden space could be reduced even further should both extensions be built.
9. I acknowledge that the proposed extension would improve internal living space and that this would be of greater use to the appellant than the rear yard. However, there is no conclusive evidence before me which indicates that the required living space could not be achieved with an extension that retains sufficient external space.
10. Taking all the above into consideration, the proposal would not provide satisfactory living conditions for occupiers of No 22 and therefore conflicts with Policy ENV3 of the Craven Local Plan 2012-2032 (November 2019) (the LP) which seeks to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants.

Character and appearance

11. The proposed extension would be of a considerable scale and mass and would be an overly dominant addition to the restricted rear garden. Given the width and projection of the extension, there is limited space within the garden to offset its total mass, even if the outbuilding were to be removed. As such, it would appear cramped within the site.
12. Consequently, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the appeal site and would conflict with Policy ENV3 of the LP which also seeks to ensure the design of development respects the form of existing buildings.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hannah Ellison

Appeal Planning Officer

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Susan Ashworth
INSPECTOR