
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2022

by J Downs BA(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/N2739/D/22/3296653

11 Selby Road, Riccall, York YO19 6QP

- 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 Jaron Goulding against the decision of Selby District Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/0111/HPA, dated 31 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 4 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is described in the application as "rear extension and internal alterations to suit occupiers needs".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for rear extension and internal alterations to suit occupiers needs at 11 Selby Road, Riccall, York YO19 6QP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2022/0111/HPA, dated 31 January 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with approved plans CG2/P/01 and CG2/P/02 Rev B.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing extension.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area, and in respect of the living conditions of the occupants of No 11a Selby Road with regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. No 11 is a semi-detached property with a pitched roof, two storey rear extension to half of the rear elevation and a gable feature on the original rear roof slope. It is set within a small linear cluster of properties with generous plots giving its immediate surrounds a residential character albeit within the open countryside. There is a general coherence to the cluster in terms of the original architecture, siting and form, although several have been amended incrementally over time. As a result of their position in the topography and the surrounding landscaping, the cluster is not prominent in the landscape.

4. Based on the undisputed figures in the Council's report, the appeal proposal would, cumulatively with the previous extensions, result in a significant increase in the volume of the dwelling. It would infill the area between the original dwelling, site boundary and extension, making it closely related to the existing built form. It would also be viewed in relation to the surrounding dwellings which have had a range of additions. Views of the appeal proposal would be further limited due to the linear pattern of development. It would therefore not visually dominate the dwelling, nor be visually intrusive in the landscape.
5. I noted that a number of the surrounding dwellings have a distinctive hip feature on the rear roof slope including on the appeal property. However, its impact as a design feature has been diluted by the extensions and alterations at some of the surrounding properties, most significantly the gable roof on the extension at the appeal site. The proposed extension would replicate the design of this existing extension and would therefore appear as a coherent addition when viewed alongside it, subject to the proposed use of matching materials which could be controlled by condition.
6. I accept the proposed extension would be substantial in floorspace and scale in relation to the original dwelling. However visually it would assimilate with the existing built form of the property and, in materials and detailing, integrate appropriately with it. Therefore it would not appear disproportionate, notwithstanding its scale, and would not dominate No 11 visually.
7. In relation to this main issue, the appeal proposal would be in keeping with the appearance of the dwelling in accordance with Selby District Local Plan February 2005 (SDLP) Policy ENV1 and would have regard to the context of its surroundings in the open countryside in accordance with Selby District Core Strategy October 2013 (SDCS) Policy SP19. It would not erode the open character and appearance of the countryside and would be in accordance with SDLP Policy H14 when read as a whole.

Living conditions

8. There is a first-floor window to 11a Selby Road positioned close to the shared boundary between the properties. The appeal proposal would be in close proximity to this window. Due to this proximity and the length of the proposed extension, it would inevitably change the outlook from this window and result in a limited sense of enclosure being created. However, the open outlook from that window to the north-east would remain. In my view, given that outlook from No 11a is generally good on account of its rural setting, any effect in this regard would be offset by good levels of outlook elsewhere. Indeed a reasonable degree of outlook from the first floor window would, in my view, still remain.
9. I therefore conclude on this main issue that the appeal proposal would not unduly affect outlook or result in an unacceptable sense of enclosure. It would suitably preserve the living conditions of the occupiers of 11a Selby Road in accordance with SDLP Policy ENV1.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole along with all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions above.

J Downs

INSPECTOR