



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/D/25/3371665

9 Pilmoor Drive, Richmond, North Yorkshire DL10 5BJ

- 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 & Mrs Lightfoot against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZD25/00296/FULL.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupants of 7 Pilmoor Drive with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal dwelling is a single storey semi-detached bungalow situated on a cul-de-sac of similar properties. The appeal property is separated from No.7 Pilmoor Drive by a combination of both properties' respective single storey extensions set against the boundary and a timber fence.
5. The appeal scheme would adjoin the existing single storey extension. Due to the extent of the projection of the proposed development from the rear of the property, it would result in a long wall along the shared boundary with No.7. This, combined with its height and blank, featureless appearance would dominate views from the rear windows and garden of No.7. On my site visit I was able to view the site of the proposed development from the rear of No. 7. This cumulative visual dominance would unacceptably reduce the quality of outlook from both the neighbour's closest habitable room windows and the garden space to the immediate rear of No.7 to the detriment of the living conditions of its occupants.
6. The rear elevation of both No.7 and the appeal dwelling is south facing. As a result, sun light is experienced throughout the day when conditions allow. The introduction of the appeal proposal would reduce the sunlight that occupants of no.7 would experience later in the day through virtue of the extension's depth and height. Whilst I note that there is a reduction of light experienced in this part of the day as a

result of the existing extension, the introduction of an even deeper built form against the boundary would exacerbate this. Whilst the level of harm this would cause would be moderate, it would be to the detriment of the living conditions of the occupants and garden users of No.7.

7. There is a close boarded timber fence separating the gardens of the appeal dwelling and No.7 as well as several detached outbuildings in the garden of No.7 against the boundary. However, these would be much lower than the eaves and total height of the extension and thus would not sufficiently mitigate its adverse effects as I have explained them.
8. Whilst I note that the occupants of No.7 have not objected to the appeal scheme, this would not obviate the need for an assessment as to its effects in the context of the main issue, particularly as occupants of a property inevitably change over time.
9. Therefore, the proposal would result in harm to the living conditions of the occupants of 7 Pilmoor Drive with regard to outlook and light. As such the proposal would conflict with Policy CP13 of the Richmondshire Local Plan (2014) which, amongst other things, seeks to protect local amenity.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has commented that the proposed development would be sensitively designed. This is not, however, pertinent to the main issue, and it is, in any event, a requirement of national planning policy that developments are well designed. I therefore give this limited weight.
11. The appellant has commented that the proposed development would create much needed family living space. Such personal circumstances, however, seldom outweigh land use planning considerations, and I also give them limited weight in the appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. The proposal would not accord with the development plan, when taken as a whole, and there are no material considerations of sufficient magnitude to indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.
13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR