



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 May 2025

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/E2001/D/25/3362964

18 Canal Side West, Newport, East Riding of Yorkshire HU15 2RN

- 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 Ms. M. Falkingham against the decision of the East Riding of Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/03599/PLF.
 - The development proposed is described as Proposed Rear Two Storey Extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Amended plans were considered by the Council prior to the determination of the planning application which included adding a hipped roof to the originally proposed flat room structure. I have therefore considered this appeal on the basis of the plans submitted: Drawing No's. S101 Rev C and F101 Rev G as this is what the Council based its assessment on.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the development on (i) the character and appearance of the host property and area in general; and (ii) the living conditions of occupiers of No. 17 Canal Side West.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is within a predominantly residential area which has various forms and designs of residential properties. The appeal property is a modest end terraced traditional two storey dwelling. Properties on the terraced row have been altered or extended historically, including the appeal site. Notwithstanding this there is a harmony to the architectural design of the terrace.
5. I observed during my site visit that some properties in the area have an elongated side two storey gable wall for instance No's. 1 and 20 which are also end terraced however the elongated side walls to these properties differ from the proposal before me. Notwithstanding this due to the various built form of properties in the area the proposed development would not be incongruous to the streetscene.

6. The proposed development would increase the mass of the existing property, however the proposed roof form which is lower than the existing ridge and the use of material to match the existing built form would be sympathetic to the existing property.
7. I find that the development would not harm the character and appearance of the host property and area in general.
8. In relation to the main issue relating to character and appearance the proposed development would not conflict with Policy ENV1 of the East Riding Local Plan 2012-2029, Strategic Document (2016) (the Local Plan) and the East Riding of Yorkshire, Design Guidance for House Extensions (the Design Guidance) which amongst other things seeks to support the delivery of high-quality design which relate well to its context.
9. There is also no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (the Framework) and the National Design Guide which seeks to ensure developments are of good design appropriate and sympathetic to their surroundings.

Living Conditions

10. No. 17 Canal Side West is to the south of the appeal site. The proposed development would be set in at first floor from the boundary shared with No. 17. Despite the set in from the boundary the projection of the extension would exceed 4.2m in close proximity to a rear first floor bedroom window at No. 17.
11. There would be loss of light to the rear window however given the orientation of the appeal site to No. 17 this would be limited. Nevertheless, due to the scale of the proposed development and proximity to the rear window the extension would be overbearing to the outlook at the occupiers of No. 17.
12. The appellant has drawn my attention to lack of insulation, damp issues and a roof which leaks, whilst this maybe the case, I have not been provided with substantive evidence to demonstrate that the proposed development is the only way to alleviate these issues. Notwithstanding this each development must be considered on its individual merits, and I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal.
13. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of occupiers of No. 17 Canal Side West. In relation to the main issue relating to the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of occupiers of No. 17 Canal Side West the proposed development would conflict with Policy ENV1 of the Local Plan and the Design Guidance which seeks amongst other things to protect the amenities of existing properties.
14. There is also conflict with the Framework which seeks to ensure developments maintain a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Conclusion

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

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR