



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C2741/D/25/3368692
117 Chapelfields Road York YO26 5AD

- 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 and Mrs Ellwood against the decision of York City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00629/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as First floor single storey side extension and front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an end terraced property within a predominantly residential area. Properties within terraces within the area generally share similar features with others in the row and have a uniformity in terms of design. Whilst some properties in the area have been extended or altered, overall, the architectural harmony remains. Gaps between end terraced properties at first floor are a noticeable characteristic.
4. The proposed first floor extension would add bulk to the host property which has been historically extended. The proposed first floor extension though slightly set back from the existing single storey extension and down from the roof ridge height would not be subservient to the host property. The scale and design of the proposed extension would be an imposing addition to the property which would reduce the gap between the appeal site and No. 115 Chapelfields Road.
5. My attention has been drawn by the appellant to other first floor side extensions in the area. I observed during my site visit that there were a limited number of two-storey side extensions in the immediate area, this form of development is not a predominant feature. Each development must be considered on its individual merits, and I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal. I find that the proposed first floor extension would be incongruous to the existing property and streetscene.

6. The appeal site front door is located directly adjacent that of No. 119 Chapelfields Road sharing a surround which is a feature of this row and other terraces of the same design. The proposed porch would remove this feature which would unbalance the uniformity of the terrace.
7. There are a number of porches in the immediate area, however where they are located adjacent to a neighbouring property's front door they generally are paired or have a canopy covering the neighbours door. The appellant has provided photographs of porches in the area which mainly detail paired porches or porches which are not adjacent a neighbours front door. These are not comparable to the proposal before me.
8. A photograph has been provided of a porch/front extension to No. 83, whilst this is not directly comparable to the proposed porch it does endorse my view that a standalone porch close to a door on a neighbouring property is out of keeping.
9. I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and area in general.
10. The proposed development would be contrary to Policy D11 of the City of York Council, Local Plan, Plan Period 2017-2033 (2025) and the City of York Council 'House Extensions and Alterations' Supplementary Planning Document (2012), which seek amongst other things for developments to respond to immediate architectural character and local character.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has highlighted that the development is required due to personal circumstances in terms of the size of the family occupying the property, however this does not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

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

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR