



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2022

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C2741/W/22/3299508

Heworth Conservative Club, 16-18 East Parade, York YO31 7YJ

- 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 Roy Walker of the Heworth and Bootham Conservative Club against the decision of City of York Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00186/FUL, dated 19 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 6 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is porch to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the development provided on the planning application form has been replaced by an amended version on the decision notice and in subsequent appeal documents. I consider that subsequent description to accurately represent the proposal and I have therefore used it within this decision.
3. The Council cite policies contained in the Draft Development Control Local Plan 2005 (the DCLP), which has been approved by the Council for development control purposes. It also refers to policies in the emerging Publication Draft York Local Plan 2018 (the PDLP), although I am not aware of the extent of any unresolved objections to the policies of this document. Neither of these plans have been formally adopted as part of the statutory development plan. On that basis I have given these policies only limited weight in accordance with paragraph 48 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property, with due regard to the Heworth/Heworth Green/East Parade/Huntington Road Conservation Area (the CA)

Reasons

5. The appeal site consists of a club building located in a terrace which contains residential and commercial buildings of varying designs. The building is of an understated almost austere appearance, with a door casement providing a degree of visual interest.

6. The CA consists of a number of streets which have a collective village scale, identity and character typical of piecemeal development. It is this character which contributes to the importance of the CA as a designated heritage asset. Based on what I have seen and read, the appeal building is of no particular architectural or historic interest, and is a neutral feature within the CA.
7. Within the understated context of the façade of the building, the proposed porch would appear as an incongruous and unduly decorative feature projecting beyond the strong alignment of the front wall of the building.
8. There is some variation of the designs of buildings within the terrace, including commercial frontages, projecting canopies, and bay windows at ground floor level and above. However, even within this varied streetscape, the porch would appear as an obtrusive feature projecting beyond the strong building line established by the appeal site and its immediate neighbours. Although the properties on either side include commercial 'shop' fronts, these are not of the same bulk and projection as the proposed porch.
9. Furthermore, porches are not a common feature within this streetscape, which would add to the jarring appearance of the proposal. The low wall with railings above projecting to the front of the building and the means of enclosure and planting of residential properties in the terrace also do not establish a context which would justify the proposal.
10. The proposal would respect the symmetry of the host building, and it may be possible to use matching materials. The profile of the roof would also reflect the front gables of buildings elsewhere in the terrace, although these are distinctly separate from the appeal site which does not contain similar features. These considerations would not be sufficient to mitigate for the unacceptable design and location of the proposed porch.
11. I am mindful that the porch would provide a more sheltered entrance to the building. However, it should be possible to achieve this through the construction of an internal vestibule, and this matter does not therefore weigh in favour of the proposal as a public benefit.
12. I conclude that, due to its location and design, the proposal would lead to unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host building, and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Whilst the harm to the CA would be less than substantial, there are no public or other benefits which would outweigh the significant weight I give to the identified harm.
13. The proposal would therefore conflict with policies D1, D4 and D11 of the PDL, and policies GP1, HE2 and HE3 of the DCLP. Taken together, these policies set out that development proposals that cause damage to the character and quality of an area will be refused, that proposals to extend existing buildings will be supported where the design and scale is appropriate to the main building and responds positively to its immediate architectural context and local character, and that development proposals within a CA will only be permitted where there is no adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. For the reasons stated previously, I give these policies limited weight in my consideration of this appeal, although this does not negate the harm I have identified.

14. The proposal would also be contrary to the Framework in respect of achieving well-designed places as well as conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

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

David Cross

INSPECTOR