



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 22 June 2021

by Paul Martinson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/N2739/D/20/3263421

4 The Crescent, Kelfield, Selby YO19 6RQ

- 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 Miss Sarah Finn against the decision of Selby District Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/0510/HPA, dated 22 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Miss Sarah Finn against Selby District Council. That is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The Crescent is a group of three blocks of terraced dwellings that are set back from Main Street positioned around a central access road. Due to the low hedge and fence heights of the front gardens, all blocks, including the appeal site, are easily visible from Main Street and contribute to the streetscene. The dwellings in the Crescent are of red brick construction with hipped, tiled roofs and small front gardens. Notwithstanding that hipped roofs are less common, although present at Lilac House and Willow Garth nearby, I saw that No 4 and its attached neighbours were broadly consistent with the overwhelming character of this part of the street which is of dwellings constructed of red brick with tiled roofs, set back from the road behind front gardens. I saw that these materials were dominant throughout Main Street, giving a consistency and distinctive feel to the character and appearance of the area.
5. No. 4 is an end of terrace dwelling to the central block of terraces. It is proposed to construct a larch clad extension to the side of the dwelling with a flat parapet roof set just below eaves level. The extension would be set back from the front elevation by 100 millimetres. The flat roof would accommodate a sedum modular living roof system.
6. Policies ENV1 of the Selby District Local Plan (2005) ('the SDLP') and SP19 of the Selby Core Strategy (2013) ('the SCS') seek to achieve high quality design

having regard to the local context and seek the best use of land without compromising local distinctiveness, character and form. On the site visit I saw the proposed extension would be seen from Main Street alongside the existing row of terraced dwellings. Its flat parapet roof would fail to reflect the context of pitched and tiled roofs that are distinctive features of the host dwelling and surrounding area and would conflict with the character and appearance of No 4. I saw no examples of flat roofs with equivalent prominence in the immediate vicinity. Whilst I note the appellant's examples of these roofs, they are in another settlement and not visible from the appeal site.

7. Furthermore, timber cladding is not characteristic of the local area and, given its position and contrast with the prevailing red brick, it would be highly conspicuous in views from Main Street, exacerbating the prominence of the extension and its conflicting roof form, leading to it appearing incongruous in this setting. In my view, the key to integrating contemporary design into an existing setting is to ensure that it responds positively and sympathetically to its context. That is a position recognised in broad terms by the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework'), paragraph 127 of which sets out how development should be 'sympathetic to local character and history'. In this instance, the design has little relevance to the local context with materials and form that are not sympathetic to the host dwelling or the character and appearance of the area.
8. Policy SP15 (B) advises, amongst other things, that where necessary and appropriate, schemes should improve energy efficiency and minimise energy consumption through design and incorporate sustainable design and construction techniques including green roofs. I acknowledge the support through Policy SP15 and that there are sustainability benefits of the extension, namely through its type of construction and the green roof. However, the level of such benefits arising from a single domestic extension are comparatively minor and are outweighed by the harm to the character and appearance of the area that I have found above.
9. I have had regard to several grants of planning permission that the appellant considers to be similar to the appeal proposal. However, I have not been provided with full details of the circumstances that led to these being approved, for example pre-existing development, permissions or the relevant policy context that applied at that time. Aside from the photograph at Appendix 8 where only a small portion of the extension appears to be visible above surrounding buildings, I note that only one of these relates to an extension to a dwelling and this was single storey, proposed matching materials, and was to the rear. Nonetheless I have assessed the appeal on its own merits.
10. The appellant has highlighted the lack of objections to the proposal and I note that the application generated a number of letters of support, however, this nor the lack of objection to a scheme in itself does not mean that it is acceptable in planning terms.
11. For the above reasons the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy ENV1 of the SDLP and Policy SP19 of the SCS. The proposal would also conflict with paragraph 127 of the Framework which seeks to ensure new developments are sympathetic to local character including the surrounding built environment.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has stated that the appeal proposal has come forward due to support for sustainable design and construction techniques offered by Local Plan policies and the Framework. The appellant argues that they would not have taken this route had they thought it would result in a design which would appear incongruous within this locality. Whilst I sympathise with the appellant in this respect, in coming to my decision I have, and must, determine this appeal on its merits, based on the site-specific circumstances of the case and considering the development plan as a whole.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given, having considered the development plan as a whole, along with all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Martinson

INSPECTOR