



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 April 2022

by C Megginson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N2739/D/22/3291017

2 Old Builders Yard Cottages, Chestnut Road, Cawood, Selby YO8 3TB

- 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 Steven Smith against the decision of Selby District Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/0455/HPA, dated 13 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first floor over existing single storey kitchen.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. Whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Cawood Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a semidetached, two-storey dwelling within the Old Town character zone of the CA as identified in the Cawood Conservation Area Appraisal (2021). The CA contains a mix of residential development, and Chestnut Road is largely two-storey dwellings in brick with either pantile or slate pitched roofs. In keeping with the character of the area, these properties are built up to the back of the footpath and feature rooflines which have a simple, straightforward design. Regular gaps in the streetscene give a pleasing, open feel. To the rear, the appeal property has an attractive symmetry with the adjoining property. In this context, I consider that the appeal property, as part of a semidetached block and as part of the wider street, makes a positive contribution to the character of the Conservation Area.
4. Whilst the appeal proposal would not be visible from directly opposite or along the street from the west, the end gable of the appeal property, along with the lean to garage to the side, sits in a prominent gap in the streetscene when viewed from the east. Whilst I appreciate the choice of matching materials in the proposed extension, the appeal proposal would be clearly visible from the east and would introduce a large area of bulk and mass to the roof. The depth, width and height of the proposal would fundamentally alter the roofline and unbalance its form. It would accordingly unacceptably impact the symmetry with the adjoining property to the rear. The scale of the addition would erode the gap in the streetscene, diminishing the overall character of the semi-detached dwellings.

5. My attention has been drawn to other first floor gables and extensions in the area, including examples in the surrounding streets. I do not have the full details that led to these proposals being accepted. Whilst I appreciate that gable features are not uncommon within the CA, the circumstances in each proposal are likely to be different, and in any event the fact that apparently similar extensions may have been permitted is not a reason, on its own, to allow unacceptable development. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits, having regard to the character and appearance of the CA. The character and appearance of the CA would therefore, as a result of the appeal scheme, be neither preserved nor enhanced.
6. The harm that would arise would be localised and therefore the impact on the CA would be less than substantial when considering the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). In such circumstances the Framework states that harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Benefits in this case would appear to be largely private, and, as such would not outweigh the harm that I have identified to which I am required to give great weight.
7. Thus, the proposal would be in conflict with Policies ENV1 and ENV25 of the Selby District Local Plan (2005) and Policies SP18 and SP19 of the Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan (2013) which seek to secure high quality design that enhances or reinforces local distinctiveness.

Conclusion

8. The appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan. There are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate a decision other than in accordance with it. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

C. Megginson

INSPECTOR