



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: 27 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/D/25/3362011

34 Wolsey Croft, Sherburn In Elmet, Leeds LS25 6DP

- 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 Mike Redington against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZG2024/1212/HPA.
 - The development proposed is described as single storey rear extension, loft conversion with gable conversion, front and rear facing dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for single storey rear extension, loft conversion with gable conversion, front and rear facing dormers at 34 Wolsey Croft, Sherburn In Elmet, Leeds LS25 6DP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref ZG2024/1212/HPA and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions set out below:
 - 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 the materials identified on the application form and approved plans: MMR001 001 Proposed Site Plans; MMR001 003; and Proposed Elevations MMR001 004.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with the approved plans.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area and the host property itself.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached bungalow in a symmetrical pair within a residential area. The area is characterised predominantly by semi-detached bungalows many of which have been altered. Front box dormers are a common feature in the area, however the design and scale of these vary. Hip to gable roof alterations is also not uncommon.

4. Properties in the area do not have a harmonious architectural rhythm many semi-detached bungalows do not retain symmetrical features due to historic alterations.
5. The proposed development would unbalance the symmetry of the semi-detached bungalow nevertheless the resulting development would be in keeping with the character of the area and would not appear incongruous, given the many examples of similar developments in the immediate area. Whilst the front box dormer is large, due to the varying designs in the area the proposed development would not be incongruous.
6. The Council did not raise concern with regard to the proposed single storey rear extension or the rear box dormer from the information before me I do not disagree.
7. I conclude that the development does not harm the character and appearance of the area and the host property itself. There is no conflict with SP19 of the Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan (2013) which seek amongst other things to ensure developments are of high quality design having regard to the local character, identity and context of its surroundings.

Conclusion and conditions

8. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be allowed.
9. I have imposed a standard condition relating to the commencement of development and a condition specifying the relevant plans as this provides certainty. In order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area I have imposed a condition concerning materials.

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR