
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 April 2025

by **Alison Scott (BA Hons) Dip TP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C2741/D/25/3359275

2 Green Way, Huntington, York YO32 9QE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Phil Ramsden against the decision of City of York Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01560/FUL.
 - The development proposed is Minor changes to the elevation following the introduction of External Wall Insulation (EWI) and new roof finishes following the introduction of further roof insulation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. During the course of the appeal, the City of York Local Plan 2025 has been adopted. The policies of the new local plan are afforded full weight.
3. I note the change in the description of the proposal by the Council from the appellant's application form as '*Gable front roof extension, replacement roof tiles, and external wall insulation comprising render to all elevations.*' To my mind this acceptably conveys the spirit of the proposal before me.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located off the estate road of Greenacres, a suburban housing development of modern bungalows in the main, where spurs of cul-du-sacs of residential dwellings are characteristic. Green Way is a cul-du-sac of around seven pairs of semi-detached bungalows. They all follow the same symmetrical design and material composition. As the appeal site is a corner plot, it turns the corner with Greenacres where the side return has been visibly extended.
6. Many of the bungalows of Green Way have been altered although they retain their traditional characteristics especially to the front elevation; a cat-slide roof a unifying characteristic. The appellant proposes to create a projecting peaked gable end to replace the cat-slide roof as the new roof formation.
7. Although the bungalow has been extended previously, this is of a low level scale and does not compromise the character of the bungalow, even if it introduces a gable style, it has a limited effect upon the front of the dwelling. The proposal would

be a significant change to the design aesthetic by way of the front peaked gable end projecting from the roof as well as a complete render finish. These changes would fail to integrate positively with the more traditional character of dwellings at Green Way. As the appeal site forms part of a pair of semi-detached dwellings, the imbalance that would be created would be at odds with the existing uniformity.

8. Whilst some render is visible in close quarters, and indeed seen elsewhere within the wider estate, the proposal as a whole would not represent local distinctiveness. Instead, it would appear as an uncharacteristic and visually obtrusive form of development that would harm the character and appearance of the street scene.
9. I could see that the wider estate contains various styles of dwellings. Some also have peaked gable ends to the front elevation. However, these are not experienced in the same context as the appeal proposal which forms part of a cohesive enclave of semi-detached bungalows that all share the same design characteristics. Also, the appellant brings to my attention another dwelling within Greenacres that they draw comparison to. This is a detached dwelling on a different road and does not follow the same characteristics as the proposal or its context. I apply limited weight to this.
10. The appellant points to requiring extra natural daylight to their habitable space as well as the benefits of insulation the proposal would bring. These things would be an improvement in environmental terms although they should be weighed against the change that would arise to the 'face' of the bungalow. This I have concluded to be harmful to the character and appearance of the local area.
11. Therefore, the proposal would not meet the good design objectives of Policy H4 of the Huntington Neighbourhood Plan, Policy D11 of the City of York Local Plan 2025, and guidance contained within House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2012), and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

12. The appellant complains about their experience with the Council planning officer and lack of consultation with them. This is an issue to take forward with the Council and is not within my remit to comment upon.
13. No effects to residential amenity have been sited by the Council or objections received to the proposal including from the Parish Council. These are neutral in the overall scheme of things and neither weighs for or against the proposal.

Conclusion

14. I have considered all matters that have been raised and conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other material considerations which lead me to determine the appeal otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR