



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2025

by **P Storey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/D/25/3375086

116 Springfield Road, Sherburn in Elmet, North Yorkshire LS25 6DE

- 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 Richard Williams against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZG2025/0472/HPA.
 - The development proposed is rear second storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached house within an established residential estate. Both the appeal property and its adjoining dwelling feature extensions that broadly mirror one another, comprising two-storey side extensions that project rearwards to form matching rear-facing gables, together with single-storey rear projections that meet at the shared boundary. This mirroring contributes to a coherent appearance and reinforces the prevailing built form within this part of the estate.
4. The proposal seeks to add a first-floor extension above part of the existing single-storey rear projection. The extension would incorporate a flat roof and would attach to the existing two-storey rear gable. A gap would remain between the proposed extension and the shared boundary with the adjoining property. Owing to the contrast of its flat-roofed design against the prevailing form of the dwelling, the development would be read as a clear addition to the first-floor rear elevation.
5. The rear elevation is visible from neighbouring houses and gardens. In addition, the landform and street layout provide clear views towards it from public vantage points along Springfield Road to the south. Although there are some streets of flat-roofed houses nearby, the immediate area's prevailing character is defined by pitched roofs on both original dwellings and later extensions. In this context, upper-storey additions typically maintain this visual consistency.
6. Policy SP19 of the Selby District Core Strategy Local Plan, Adopted Version 22 October 2013 (the CS) requires all development proposals to achieve high quality design and have regard to the local character, identity and context of its surroundings. Among other considerations, development should respect local

distinctiveness and positively contribute to the scale, form, and appearance of the surrounding area.

7. In this context, introducing a flat-roofed first-floor structure in a visually prominent position would appear uncharacteristic and incongruous. When read alongside the established pitched-roof forms of the host property, its adjoining neighbour and the surrounding streetscape, the proposed roof profile and associated massing would disrupt this coherent relationship. This isolated form at upper-storey level would cause the extension to stand out unsympathetically, undermining the consistent design qualities that currently define this part of the estate. This harm would be appreciable both from neighbouring plots and from the public realm.
8. The appellant contends that the extension would be subservient, that matching materials would assist visual integration, and that the mixed character of the wider area supports a broader acceptability of different roof forms. However, although flat-roofed dwellings exist further afield, they are only fleetingly visible from the appeal site through gaps between buildings and were originally constructed with that distinctive form. This is clearly different from the prevailing character of the appeal site's immediate setting. Moreover, the use of matching materials would not resolve the fundamental design conflict arising from the extension's roof form and massing. The appellant's design arguments therefore do not alter my previous findings.
9. The appellant's sustainability arguments, including the desire to avoid removing existing solar panels, to support the property's renewable energy performance, and to reduce material use, are material considerations. The development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework support energy-efficient development and the use of sustainable construction techniques. However, such considerations do not overcome the requirement for proposals to respond positively to local character. Additionally, while I acknowledge the appellant's personal requirements for additional living accommodation, and the efficient use of land that the proposal would achieve, these matters do not outweigh the clear conflict with the development plan arising from the identified harm to character and appearance.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area and conflict with Policy SP19 of the CS, the aims of which have previously been set out.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P Storey

INSPECTOR