



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 12 October 2021

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C2741/D/21/3277020

16 Alwyne Grove, York YO30 5RT

- 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 Andrew Ventress against the decision of City of York Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00428/FUL, dated 20 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension to replace existing temporary single storey garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council's Development Management Officer Report makes reference to amendments to the proposal that were made during the course of the planning application. I therefore determine the appeal on the basis of the amended plans which have been provided.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is located at the end of Alwyne Grove, a residential street consisting of semi-detached properties fronting onto the public highway. There are many examples of subsequent two-storey side extensions that have taken place since the dwellings were constructed, and these display a wide array of designs and styles, resulting in variation in the street scene at different locations along the road. At the present time the appeal dwelling has a single storey side extension of considerable width, and the adjoining semi-detached dwelling has a flat-roofed two storey side extension which is set well back from its front elevation.
5. The proposed development would extend substantially from the original side elevation of the dwelling, approximately doubling its two-storey width. It would also incorporate a substantial roof structure, would include only a very limited setback from the front elevation and would have a sizeable ground floor element that would project forward. As a result of this design, it would visually dominate both its host dwelling and the pair of semi-detached dwellings as a whole. Furthermore, due to the location of the appeal property at the head of

the cul-de-sac and its angled position, the proposal would be clearly visible from a number of vantage points within the street scene. Due to its design, positioning and overall visual dominance, the proposal would therefore cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

6. There are a number of examples of existing two storey side extensions present in the street scene. However, the existing extensions which have most successfully integrated in terms of both their host dwellings and the street scene are the more recent examples, to which the Council refers. These primarily achieve subserviency through a combination of their restrained widths and their first-floor setbacks from the original front elevations of the dwellinghouses. None of the two-storey extensions to which my attention has been drawn by the appellant in the immediate vicinity are comparable in width to that which the appeal development proposes, and several do not have a visual relationship to their host dwelling that would be promoted by more recent design thinking. These other extensions therefore do not justify the appeal proposal.
7. For these reasons I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Consequently, the proposal would fail to accord with Policies GP1 and H7 of the Development Control Draft Local Plan 2005, where they seek to safeguard character and appearance. There would also be a conflict with Policies D1 and D11 of the City of York Local Plan – Publication Draft 2018, with the House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2012 and with The National Planning Policy Framework in the same respect.

Other Matters

8. My attention has been drawn to other decisions made elsewhere by the Council or on appeal, but none of these examples are drawn from properties found close to the appeal site. They therefore do not contribute to the character and appearance of this area and, in any event, I must determine the appeal primarily on the merits of the development that is before me.
9. Whilst it is stated that extensions to the rear of the appeal property have been discounted due to concerns relating to the impact upon the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent dwellings, there is no substantive information provided in this regard. I also accept that the appellant is seeking to maximise the provision of new floorspace and provide garaging, but this does not justify the harmful impact that would arise upon character and appearance as a result of the appeal proposal.
10. Reference is made to the previous upkeep of the dwelling but neither this, nor the fact that a letter of support was submitted during the planning application consultation period, overcome the harm that I have found.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR