



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2024

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/23/3329477

33 Queensway, Woodmansey, Beverley HU17 0TL

- 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 Michael Dixon against the decision of East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref: 23/01476/PLF dated 15 May 2023 was refused by notice dated 27 July 2023.
 - The application is for single storey extension to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the determination of this application a revised National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) was published in December 2023. I have therefore determined this appeal in accordance with the revised provisions within the Framework.
3. The description of development used on the appellants original application form differs from that used by the Council. In Part E of the appeal form the Appellants Agent has confirmed that the description used by the Council is the same as that intended. Accordingly, I have used the description used by the Council as this more accurately reflects the development proposed.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area and upon the living conditions of neighbours.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a semi detached house within this recent development of similar properties. The property is constructed of red brick and occupies a fairly generous corner plot whereby the parking for the house is to the rear adjacent to an existing timber home office/shed. To the rear the house has a single storey UPVC conservatory and decking which runs the entire length of the garden here where it adjoins the immediate neighbour.
6. The proposal is a relatively simple one whereby the conservatory would be removed and a single storey, flat roof extension would be created running the

length of the existing decking area immediately alongside the shared boundary with number 31 Queensway. The proposed extension would include bi-folding doors and lantern roof lights and would continue the red brick material.

7. In considering this appeal Local Plan Policy ENV1 of the East Riding Local Plan (ERLP) is particularly relevant as is the Council's Supplementary Design Guide for House Extensions (SPD), both of which seek to achieve a high quality of design for new extensions that minimise their impact upon the living conditions of neighbours largely through controlling the extend of such extensions along adjoining boundaries.
8. In this proposal the rear extension would, in some ways, attempt to respond to the context of the area and the proximity of residents at number 31 through its flat roof and simple forms and materials.
9. However, notwithstanding these minor concessions, the proposed extension would be a full single storey in height that would extend around 1m over that of the existing screen fence between number 33 and 31. This height of development together with it abutting the shared boundary for much of its length, would result in an over dominant extension.
10. The proposal would also likely see overshadowing of the neighbour's rear ground floor rooms and garden at certain times due to its orientation due east of number 31. The result of this would compound the over dominant effect and harmful sense of enclosure.
11. Ultimately, although I consider that there would be ways to design an extension that could minimise the harm that I have identified above, the proposal before me is too extensive and poorly sited with regards any desire to protect the quality of the living conditions in the neighbouring property.
12. As such, the proposal would cause a harmful impact upon neighbours and would fail to reflect the guidance either in the SPD or within Policy ENV1 of the Local Plan. Accordingly, there would be a minor impact upon the character of the area through this extension appearing over dominant due to its size and scale to the rear of the appeal property. As such, this appeal must fail for these reasons.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given, and taking into account of all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR