
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 3 December 2025

by **Paul Martinson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 December 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/C2741/W/25/3367529

6 Clifton, York YO30 6AE

- 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 Mrs Carolyn Jowett against the decision of City of York Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00020/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'Two storey and single storey rear extensions'.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/C2741/Y/25/3367530

6 Clifton, York YO30 6AE

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Carolyn Jowett against the decision of City of York Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00021/LBC.
 - The works proposed are described as: 'Internal and external alterations including new side door opening, new/replacement windows, reconfiguration of first floor plan by removal and replacement of internal walls, and two storey rear extension and single storey rear extension following partial demolition of existing rear extension'.
-

Decisions

1. *Appeal A*: The appeal is dismissed.
2. *Appeal B*: The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

3. An application for costs has been received from Mrs Carolyn Jowett against City of York Council. That is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

4. I have taken the description of works and development from the appeal forms as these more accurately describe the proposals. The application was amended prior to the Council issuing its decision. I have based my assessment on those same plans.
5. As the proposal is in a conservation area and relates to a listed building I have had special regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act). The two appeals concern the same scheme under different, complementary legislation. I have dealt with both appeals together in my reasoning.
6. Both parties consider the effect on the Clifton Conservation Area (the CA) in their evidence. I am therefore satisfied that neither party's interests would be prejudiced

by my consideration of the effect on the CA in my decision in line with the statutory duty above.

Main Issues

7. The main issues are:

- the effect of the proposal on designated heritage assets, including whether the proposal would preserve the Grade II listed building of 6 Clifton, and whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Clifton Conservation Area (the CA); (*Appeals A and B*) and
- the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of 4 Clifton with particular regard to outlook (*Appeal A*).

Reasons

Heritage Assets

Special Interest and Significance

8. The listed building, 6 Clifton, comprises a narrow mid nineteenth century outbuilding, that has previously been used as a shop and is now a detached dwelling. The building is two storeys and has a gable frontage abutting the edge of the pavement, set within a narrow plot. The frontage includes a single doorway with timber surround and a single first and ground floor window. These are '6 over 6' pane sliding sash windows. The oldest part of the building is made up of the living room on the ground floor and a first floor bedroom.
9. The north elevation adjoins a private access track that provides access to the rear and to other properties. The building has been extended on multiple occasions, and these extensions gradually step down in height with diminished depth as they extend further back into the long narrow plot. The most recent extensions comprise of a single storey garden room and utility, constructed in 2005.
10. From the evidence before me, I find the listed building's special interest and significance to be principally derived from its historic and architectural interests. Important contributors in these regards are its surviving historic fabric and its modest architecture and scale, that is nonetheless reflective of the period of its construction, its evolution over time, and its group value, forming part of a historic and varied streetscene of predominantly listed buildings. Whilst the building does not retain many internal features from this period, its historic plan form remains legible within the oldest part of the building. This also contributes to its special interest and significance.
11. The site is located within the CA which extends over Clifton and the nearby streets. From the information provided and pertinent to the appeals, the character and appearance and thus special interest and significance of the CA derives, in part, from the prevalence of the large Georgian, Victorian and Edwardian villas in the area, with their gardens and trees and the often-generous spaces between the dwellings contributing to a varied, historic and attractive streetscene.
12. The appeal property, with its gable fronting the pavement edge and flanked by much taller elegant townhouses, with space between, contributes significantly to

the variation in this historic streetscene. This historic variation contributes to the special interest and significance of the CA as a designated heritage asset.

Proposals

13. It is proposed to remove the 2005 single storey additions and construct a new two storey extension with a large adjoining single storey extension projecting out to the same extent as the demolished additions. This would involve alterations to the existing building.
14. The raising of the height of the existing two storey extension and its incorporation into a new long stretch of roof that would continue over the proposed two storey extension would become a dominant feature of the building and the longest unbroken expanse of roof, that would be at odds with the graduated nature of the roofs to the rear of the building that have developed over time. The considerable depth of this new element of the building would be contrary to the diminishing nature of the depths of rear additions that exists at present, forming a structure with considerable massing that would fail to appear subservient to the existing building, despite its lower ridge height.
15. The proposed single storey extension would be wider than the original building and its substantial, square footprint would represent a considerable addition to the building as a whole. The significant bulk and massing of this additional element and its considerably greater width would, as above, fail to appear subservient to the existing building.
16. Whilst the use of a contrasting modern material and the incorporation of contemporary features such as an asymmetrical roof form can sometimes be successfully accommodated on traditional buildings, this would not, in this instance, mitigate or disguise the significant scale and the dominance of the proposed additions. As such, for the reasons set out above, the proposed extensions would dominate the existing modest building and the site as a whole, to the detriment of its special interest and significance.
17. The proposal would also involve the removal of a side window from the oldest part of the building and its replacement with a new entrance door. Such an alteration would result in a loss of historic fabric as well as diminishing the legibility of the historic plan form and disrupting the historic patterns of circulation, introducing an entrance door where previously there was none.
18. The subdivision of the living room through the insertion of a vestibule enclosing the new side door would also, in a small way, erode the legibility of the historic plan form. Additionally, the insertion of a door between the living room would inevitably result in the removal of historic walling. The loss of historic fabric would result in harm to special interest and significance.
19. The proposed extension, owing to its location to the rear, would not be easily visible from the road, being screened by surrounding buildings. Although there would be no public rights of way across it, the proposal would be visible from the private access road and the land to the rear. It would also likely be viewed from neighbouring properties where it would be seen alongside the rear of the adjacent townhouses. Whilst not widely or publicly visible, the provision of considerable additions that would dominate this modest building in the CA, would nevertheless

incrementally erode the character of the CA. In that regard it would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA as a whole.

20. For the above reasons, the proposal would fail to preserve the Grade II listed building, 6 Clifton, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. It would also fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA. This would be contrary to the requirements of sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Act. In doing so it would cause harm to the significance of these designated heritage assets.

Public Benefits and Balance

21. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the assets' conservation. That is irrespective of the magnitude of that harm. Consistent with that approach, paragraph 213 sets out that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset, should require clear and convincing justification.
22. Given the extent and nature of the proposal, I find that the harm to heritage assets in this instance would be towards the lower end of 'less than substantial' harm but, nevertheless, of considerable importance and weight. Under such circumstances, paragraph 215 advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing the asset's optimum viable use.
23. There would be some economic benefits from the construction and occupation of the extensions. However, these would be inherently limited by the small-scale nature of the scheme. The appellant argues that the proposal would sustain the long term optimum viable use of the asset as a family home, allowing for adaption to later-life living. However, there is no evidence before me that the long-term use of the building as a dwelling is under threat, nor that the building at present would not be suitable for such purposes.
24. The overall limited public benefits are consequently not sufficient to outweigh the considerable importance and weight I attach to the identified harm to the significance of the designated heritage assets.
25. The proposal would not preserve the Grade II listed building of 6 Clifton, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. It would also fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA. This would be contrary to the requirements of sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Act and the provisions within the Framework which seek to conserve and enhance heritage assets. The harmful impact would also be contrary to Policies D4 and D5 of the City of York Local Plan (2025) (the LP) which together seek to ensure proposals conserve heritage assets and safeguard the historic environment.

Living Conditions

26. No 4 Clifton lies immediately adjacent to the appeal site. There is a narrow passageway between the two properties beyond which lies the existing single storey extension at the appeal property. The existing two storey extensions to the rear of the appeal property align roughly with the rear elevation of the dwelling at No 4. A high boundary wall projects out from the rear elevation with the single

storey elements of the appeal property forming the boundary with No 4 further into the rear of the plot. The high wall lies opposite a rear projection to No 4 resulting in the spaces adjacent to the rear of the dwelling being reasonably enclosed to both sides. This has the effect of channelling the outlook from the spaces to the rear of the dwelling towards the long open garden space beyond.

27. The proposed two storey extension would extend over the footprint of the single storey element that is currently set back from the high boundary wall. Whilst it would project out around 3 metres beyond the existing rear elevation of No 4, given the extent that it would be set back, its reasonably low overall height and, having regard to the existing enclosed nature of the space to the rear of the dwelling, I am satisfied that the proposal would not appear overbearing from No 4. Similarly, given that the principal outlook lies to the rear garden, I consider that the levels of outlook experienced by the occupiers of No 4 would not be significantly affected by the appeal scheme. For the same reasons I am not of the view that the occupiers of that property would feel unduly 'hemmed in' by the proposals.
28. For the above reasons, the proposal would preserve the living conditions of the occupiers of 4 Clifton with particular regard to outlook. The proposal would therefore comply with Policy D11 of the LP and the guidance contained within the House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (2012) which together seek to ensure new development preserves the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring occupiers including in respect of outlook. There would also be compliance with paragraph 135 of the Framework which requires new developments to provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Conclusion

29. *Appeal A*: The proposed development would conflict with the development plan. There are no material considerations that indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that Appeal A should be dismissed.
30. *Appeal B*: For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised I conclude that Appeal B should be dismissed.

Paul Martinson

INSPECTOR