



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 April 2026

by **Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 May 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/C2741/D/25/3374418

3 Lockyer Close, York YO30 6QE

- 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 Nick Pratt against the decision of the City of York Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01191/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a detached modern dwelling located in a cul-de-sac comprised of detached and semi-detached properties with variations in form and design. Where properties have garages there is generally space between them and the adjacent dwellings, but with some exceptions.
4. The proposed extension would infill a small truncated triangular side area located between the dwelling and its detached garage. The intention is to provide a ground floor bedroom with en-suite facilities and an improved dining room/kitchen layout.
5. The Council considers that the proposal would not harm the amenity of neighbours. I see no reason to disagree as there would be no significant adverse impact on 2 and 4 Lockyer Close, and there would be sufficient separation distance from the rear elevations of properties facing the appeal site at 33-39 Brailsford Close.
6. The extension would have a low eaves height at around 2.2 metres at the rear and matching the garage at the front at approximately 2.5 metres, but the height to the ridge line would be around 5.1 metres, and higher than the first floor window of the host dwelling. The dwelling and garage block form part of a pleasant grouping of buildings in the cul-de sac. The height and scale of the extension and steep slope of its roof would make it appear out of character and incongruous when viewed from Lockyer Close. It would also diminish the space between the garage and the dwelling and would not appear as a subservient addition when viewed from Lockyer

Close because of its height and unusual relationship in terms of its connection with the main building and the garage block.

7. The appellant has referred to a potential fall-back position whereby an extension with a dual pitched roof could be constructed up to a height of 4 metres with eaves at 2.5 metres. A drawing has been submitted to indicate the visual effect of lowering the ridge height. The appellant advises that the roof could be hipped, but it would result in an extension that would look out of keeping. In addition, that it was felt that a vaulted ceiling in the bedroom would make the narrowing extension space feel larger. Although there would be a potential fall-back position I consider that it is insufficient reason to allow the appeal proposal.
8. I find that the proposed extension would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and street scene, particularly when viewed down the approach along Lockyer Close from the junction with Rainsborough Way. It would fail to comply with guidance in the Council's supplementary planning document: House Extensions and Alterations, relating to the effect of development on character and the streetscene, and with its advice on side extensions. It would also conflict with policy D11 of the City of York Local Plan which advises, amongst other things, that extensions and alterations should respond positively to their immediate architectural context and local character in terms of scale, proportion, and the space between buildings.

Other Matters

9. The appellant describes the house as having a reasonable layout but being modest in size. Reference is made to the National Described Space Standard which indicates that a 3 bed two storey dwelling should have a minimum gross internal floor area ranging between 84 and 102 m² depending on the number of bed spaces (persons) with additional built in storage of 2.5 m². The appeal property has a total floor area of 81.9 m² of which 2.5 m² is storage. The appellant concludes that the property is around 15% below the criterion for a 3 bed, 5 person two storey dwelling. However, I consider that the proposal cannot be justified on the basis of the standard in view of the harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and street scene that would result.

Conclusion

10. I acknowledge the appellant's desire to create additional accessible living space at ground floor level. However, for the reasons given above, the proposed development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and should be dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR