



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 May 2025

by **C Skelly BA (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C2741/D/25/3363477

26 Ferguson Way, Huntington, York YO32 9YG

- 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 Ian Wray against the decision of City of York Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02251/FUL.
 - The development proposed is convert ageing wooden garage (built in the early 90s) to brick to the side elevation of the property. The new garage will be a conventional brick construction suitable to house a motor vehicle and space for undertaking hobbies.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two-storey detached dwelling located in a residential cul-de-sac. It has an integral garage which adjoins a porch area which projects forward from the main elevation of the dwelling and sits underneath a pitched roof. The dwelling has off road parking and a garden to the front. To the side of the property there is a large flat roof timber garage which runs from the side elevation of the dwelling to the edge of Ferguson Way.
4. There are a mix of houses and bungalows within the cul-de-sac, of different styles which are arranged in a repeated pattern and provides a cohesive appearance to the surrounding area. The properties have gardens and driveways to the front which are generally unenclosed providing the street with an open, spacious appearance.
5. Whilst the proposed extension would replace the existing timber garage it would have a larger footprint and pitched roof. Although the proposal would be set back from the front and rear elevations of the host property, its ridgeline would align with the top of the first-floor windows, thereby visually competing with its scale. Despite being set back further from Ferguson Way than the existing garage, it would have a greater width and therefore in combination with its height would dominate the side elevation of the property. Furthermore, as it would be turned to avoid the culvert the building line would project beyond the front elevation of the dwelling, thereby increasing its prominence. This together with the additional

garage door to the principal elevation would create a visually awkward addition and undermine the balanced proportions of the host property.

6. The overall bulk and massing of the proposed extension would increase the visual enclosure of the space to the side of the dwelling, further eroding the open appearance of the street. Although the existing garage does not contribute positively to the visual appearance of the area, the proposed development, in my view, would cause further harm as a result of its scale and prominence within the street scene. Whilst I note that there have been no objections from neighbours, the absence of objection does not in itself render the scheme acceptable.
7. The appellant has referred me to 17 and 19 Ferguson Way which have large double garages and No 4 which has a detached garage turned at an angle to the host dwelling. However, in these examples there is only one garage associated with the dwelling and they are located between existing buildings. Therefore, these examples are not directly comparable to the appeal case.
8. For the reasons outlined, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy D11 of the York Local Plan (2025) and Policy H4 of the Huntington Neighbourhood Plan (2017). These policies seek amongst other things to ensure that the design of extensions and alterations to dwellings positively contribute to the surrounding area and is in keeping with the local character, having regard to scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access.

Conclusion

9. The proposal would provide an additional garage area for the parking of a motor vehicle and additional space for other hobbies enjoyed by the appellant. I have identified harm to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. These harms are not outweighed by the benefits which I have identified. The proposal therefore conflicts with the development plan. There are no material considerations that indicate that the appeal should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.
10. Accordingly for the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Skelly

INSPECTOR