



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2013

by **P Eggleton BSC(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 26 November 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2736/D/13/2206009

6 Parliament Avenue, Norton, MALTON, North Yorkshire, YO17 9HF

- 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 Simon Wall against the decision of Ryedale District Council.
 - The application Ref 13/00498/HOUSE was refused by notice dated 23 July 2013.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The plans illustrate a two storey extension that would form a continuation of the property at two storey height. The appellant has indicated that revised plans were submitted to the planning authority and the officer report indicates that various revisions were considered before a final decision was made. It appears clear that the final decision was based on the originally submitted plans. As they are the only plans I have been provided with, I have based my considerations on them.
4. The property currently has a two storey high bay window projection which provides some design interest. It breaks up the mass of the frontage giving it a well-proportioned appearance with a strong vertical emphasis to the design. The proposal would extend the frontage and as a result, the bay windows would become less prominent. The remainder of the frontage, which would have little design interest, would dominate the appearance of the dwelling. The original proportions and design are characteristic of the properties in this road and they would be lost. The proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the dwelling.
5. This proposal, if repeated would result in the two neighbouring properties having a relatively unrelieved front building line with only a small gap between them. The houses in Parliament Avenue were built as similar semi-detached properties with spacing between them, particularly at first floor level. This characteristic remains an important feature. The design proposed would, in addition to detracting from the appearance of the dwelling, result in harm to the wider character of the area.

6. There are a number of extensions in the vicinity which cover many differing design options. Number 11 appears to be very similar but I do not have the details of the circumstances that led to this being developed or the policies that were in place at that time. Number 5 does extend to the boundary but it also includes a large set back which helps to retain its original form. Others similarly include a set back at first floor level or are of a smaller scale overall. These extensions do not represent a good reason for accepting a proposal with no set back and a quite substantial width.
7. The combination of the width of the extension and its continued form to that of the main house, would detract from the appearance of the dwelling. This would harm the character and appearance of the wider area and if repeated, further detract from the character of this area of semi-detached properties. It would be contrary to Policies SP16 and SP20 of The Ryedale Plan - Local Plan Strategy 2013 as it would not reinforce local distinctiveness or respect the character or context of the host building or the locality. These policies accord with the *National Planning Policy Framework* which seeks high quality design.
8. I have considered all the matters put forward by the appellant but they are not sufficient to outweigh my concerns. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR