



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2025 by A Morrison MTCP MRTPI

Decision by R Gee BA (Hons) Dip TP PGCert UD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/C2741/D/25/3372535

294 Stockton Lane, York YO31 1JJ

- 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 Walsh against the decision of City of York Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01074/FUL.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear and side extensions, amendments to roof, including addition of roof dormers and amendments to windows.
-

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 development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. 294 Stockton Lane is a detached bungalow located within a residential area on the periphery of York. The appeal property is situated within a run of four similarly designed dwellings and has been enlarged to the rear, a scheme which simultaneously created first floor accommodation within the roof space. As a result of this previous development, the house now possesses a double side gabled roof, the inner valley of which is partly infilled by a flat roof and lantern, together with a two-storey glazed gable feature within the extended rear elevation.
5. At my site visit I noted that although the existing flat roof has been constructed at the same height as the building's ridgelines, due to the corresponding roof pitch of its flanking sections, it is set back to be hardly perceptible from public or private views. By virtue of its limited width and considered design, notwithstanding the minor projection of the lantern, the flat roof is therefore inconspicuous and does not detract from the bungalow's appearance. Whilst I appreciate that first floor headroom is currently partially restricted as a result, this is a common compromise of loft conversions as arising from the need to balance internal space with external design requirements. At the back of the property, the gabled element sits comfortably within the well-balanced rear elevation, providing a focal point through

- its more contemporary aesthetic. Accordingly, the prior extensions have respected and complemented the bungalow's essential character and appearance.
6. The appeal proposal comprises a number of elements, the first of which are rear and side ground floor extensions. Owing to their modest dimensions and design, including the use of matching materials, these would be sympathetically subordinate additions to the dwelling.
 7. It is proposed to widen the central flat roof so that it will span nearly the entire width of the original building. This would be achieved by markedly steepening the sloped areas of roof between the paired side gables. The resulting near vertical pitch of these slopes would produce a mansard-type appearance at odds with the dwelling's consistent existing roof pitches, whilst at the same time also serving to reveal the enlarged flat roof as a discordant feature. Although the proposed replacement of the lantern with a lower-profile flat roof window would be a minor betterment, this is not reliant upon the mansard alteration, and in any event would not offset the resulting negative effect to the bungalow's character and appearance.
 8. Described by the appellant as two dormers, the rear roof enlargement would similarly extend almost the full width of the original building. It would employ a flat roof built to the same height as the building's central flat section, to which it would effectively adjoin. While its left-hand portion would be recessed from the eaves and its breadth would be broken up by the retained upper part of the central rear gable, this addition would read as a large single volume by virtue of its coverage of nearly the entire roofscape. In contrast to its positive existing presence, the gable feature would now appear awkward as incorporated into the unbalanced dormer, with its right-hand cheek fully subsumed.
 9. Through its substantial resulting mass and disjointed form and glazing, the dormer would introduce a harmfully dominant and incongruous feature to the building. Notwithstanding the incorporation of matching materials, the resultant top-heavy and disorderly appearance would fail to respond to the existing architectural context. Though I acknowledge that this enlargement would be of very limited public visibility, this does not obviate the need to achieve good design.
 10. The overall effect of the roof extensions would be an ungainly expanse of flat roof covering the majority of the dwelling, paying insufficient regard to its present form. Furthermore, the associated side mansard slopes and bulky rear dormer would be incompatible to the property's existing design and scale, with the latter in particular serving to create a cumbersome and mismatched two storey exterior at the back.
 11. On this basis, the proposals would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling. The scheme would therefore fail to comply with Policy D1 of the City of York Council Local Plan 2017-2033 (LP), which, amongst other things, states that development which fails to make a positive design contribution will be refused. It would also fail to comply with LP Policy D11, which similarly requires high quality design and for building extensions to respond positively to their immediate architectural context, including in respect of scale and proportion. Moreover, the roof additions would conflict with the City of York Council House Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2012, which guides that extensions should not dominate the house or clash with its appearance.

Other Matters

12. The appellant's evidence draws attention to nearby properties along Stockton Lane possessing of a range of roof forms, including as a result of extensions and alterations. I agree that the design of buildings varies across the broader street scene and note each of the examples referenced, including flat roof dormer additions. However, the main issue in this appeal, as arising from the Council's reason for refusal, concerns the suitability of the proposal in relation to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling. Consequently, these examples, together with the appellant's analysis of the proposal in the context of developments elsewhere in the locality, do not lead me to a different conclusion on the main issue.
13. I acknowledge that the scheme would improve the functionality of the first floor to the benefit of the occupants. However, I am not persuaded that this private benefit, to which I afford limited positive weight, outweighs the harm that I have found to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the resultant conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Morrison

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

R Gee

INSPECTOR