



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2025

by F P Tinsley MA (Hons) MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C2741/D/25/3373965

2 Longcroft, Wigginton, York, YO32 2DE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Greenwood against the decision of the City of York Council.
- The application reference is Ref: 25/00684/FUL
- The development proposed is 'To construct a double storey side extension and single storey porch extension.'

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted 'To construct a double storey side extension and single storey porch extension' at 2 Longcroft, York, YO32 2DE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00684/FUL, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building/dwelling.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos. 7624-01 Apr 2025 (Location Plan) 2786136, Revised Drawing 02 Jul 2025 7624-003 (Site Plan) 2813194, Revised Drawing 02 Jul 2025 001 (Existing Plans & Elevations) 2813192, Revised Drawing 02 Jul 2025 002 (Proposed Plans & Elevations) 2813193.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs has been made by Mr Greenwood against the City of York Council. This is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, particularly the street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within a residential area predominantly comprising two-storey dwellings. There is a diversity of housing styles and several examples of extensions and alterations to original houses in the immediate vicinity.

5. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling situated at a road junction between Longcroft and Windsor Drive. It occupies a spacious plot with front, rear, and side garden areas, into which it is proposed to extend the dwelling.
6. While the Council are content with the proposed front and rear extensions, their concern related to the proposed side extension which would project approximately 2.9 metres into the garden area towards Windsor Drive. It would incorporate a mix of finishes, including brick and render, consistent with the existing property and other development in the area. A small gap to the property boundary with Windsor Drive would be retained. The roof of the side extension would be hipped and in keeping with the character and design of the existing dwelling. The new side elevation would extend a small distance beyond the front building line of the adjacent property at No.110 Windsor Drive.
7. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance: House Extensions and Alterations (SPG) refers to character and street scene, stating that the siting of an extension should not harm the pattern of buildings or the spacing between them. Where a street or group of buildings has a clearly defined building line, it should be retained, and extensions projecting forward of it should be avoided. Only in exceptional circumstances will this be appropriate, such as where the building line is not well defined. In this case, the building line on Windsor Drive is not well defined. To the rear of the appeal site, dwellings form a shallow crescent pattern, with those closest to Longcroft and Canterbury Close projecting further forward than those in the central section of this part of the street. In this context, there is scope to accommodate the proposal as broadly consistent with this pattern of development.
8. Furthermore, the SPG is guidance only and cannot address all planning circumstances associated with side extensions. There is scope for exceptions in exceptional circumstances, and the example of an unclearly defined building line applies in this instance.
9. There is no consistency in the spacing between houses in the immediate vicinity of the appeal property, which appears to have eroded over time as extensions and other structures have been added. In this context, the proposed gap to the property boundary is acceptable and broadly consistent with other single-storey extensions in the area. I am satisfied that the overall result would not harm the spaciousness of the area.
10. When viewed along Windsor Drive from the east, the two-storey extension would be noticeable within the street scene. However, it would be seen against the backdrop of other dwellings on the road and would not appear so conspicuous or visually prominent as to cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. The resulting dwelling would not be out of keeping with other extended dwellings on corner plots within the surrounding area, such as No. 12 Longcroft. As such, there would be no unacceptable harm to the overall character of this residential area.
11. For the reasons given, I conclude that the proposed development would not cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, particularly the street scene. Accordingly, it would not conflict with Policy D11 of the City of York Local Plan 2025 (the Local Plan), which requires extensions to be of high-quality design, respond positively to their immediate architectural context in

terms of scale, proportion, landscape design, and spacing between buildings, and contribute positively to the wider townscape, landscape, and views.

Other Matters

12. At the planning application stage, an objection was received from a neighbour at 151 Windsor Drive, citing concerns about overlooking into and overshadowing of their property on the north side of Windsor Drive from the side elevation of the proposed side extension. I am satisfied that, given the position of this house relative to the application site and the proposed extension, the two-storey addition would not give rise to harm to neighbours' living conditions in respect of overlooking or overshadowing. This conclusion is consistent with that of the Council on this matter.

Conditions

13. The Council has indicated conditions deemed necessary should this appeal be allowed. These have been assessed against the tests set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. For clarity, a condition is necessary to specify timescales for implementation of the permission and to identify the approved drawings. It is also necessary to impose a condition requiring the external materials of the proposed extension to match those of the host property, to assist with the assimilation of the resulting dwelling into the surrounding residential area.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed.

F P Tinsley

INSPECTOR