
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 February 2021

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N2739/D/20/3263114

22 West Park, Selby YO8 4JL

- 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 Daniel Wrigglesworth against the decision of Selby District Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/0771/HPA, dated 20 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is Rear 2 story extension for bedroom and kitchen / living diner convert existing bungalow into 3 bedrooms.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the proposal has been altered from the application form to the decision notice. I have omitted the reference to 10 semi-detached houses, as has the Council on their decision notice and the appellant on their appeal form, as this matter did not form part of this proposal. The proposal has been amended during the course of the application. I have made my decision based on the amended plans.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and on the living conditions of the occupiers of 21 West Park (No.21) with particular regard to outlook, loss of light and overshadowing.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The existing dwelling forms one of a pair of modest semi-detached bungalows at the eastern end of West Park. Although much of West Park is formed of two storey dwellings, the bungalows which occupy its eastern end show a consistency and cohesion in their design and appearance. Where an extension to a nearby bungalow has been brought to my attention, I noted that this formed a subordinate addition to the host dwelling.
5. The extension that is proposed would add a significant amount of additional floor space, much of which would be provided to the rear and side of the dwelling. However, to assist in incorporating a master bedroom at first floor

level, the ridgeline on the extension would be set noticeably higher than that on the main dwelling.

6. Whilst I accept that the property is set at the end of the cul-de-sac, the height of the extension would result in it being clearly visible from the street scene. As a result of the height of the extension the proposal would form an uncomfortable and over dominant addition to the modest host dwelling which would detract from the appearance of the dwelling and therefore harm the character and appearance of the area.
7. In this respect, the proposal would therefore fail to accord with saved Policy ENV1 of the Selby District Local Plan (SDLP) (2005) and Policy SP19 of the Selby District Core Strategy (2013) which amongst other things require proposals of high quality design which respect local character.

Living conditions

8. The extension would be of moderate depth and would not be of insignificant height. It would be set to the south of No.21, which has a window to the southern side of its rear elevation with nothing within the evidence suggesting that this window serves anything other than a habitable room.
9. However, the window at No. 21 is set slightly away from the boundary, while the extension would be set 2.5m away from the boundary. While the evidence indicates that the extension infringes the 45-degree line, this is guidance only.
10. The separation between the window and the extension would be significant in the context of the site. It would ensure that the extension would not form an oppressive feature when viewed from the closest window on the rear elevation of No.21 and that there would not be any unacceptable impact in relation to light or overshadowing.
11. The separation would therefore be sufficient to preserve the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 21 with regard to outlook, loss of light and overshadowing. In this respect, the proposal would therefore accord with saved Policy ENV1 of the SDLP where it requires account to be taken of the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

Other Matters

12. I accept that the extension would be constructed using materials to match, and that the Town Council have offered no objections. These are however neutral matters.

Conclusion

13. Whilst I have found no harm in relation to living conditions, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR