



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 January 2018

by **S Jones MA DipLP**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26<sup>th</sup> February 2018

---

### **Appeal Ref: APP/Y2736/D/17/3189398** **5 Middlecave Drive, Malton YO17 7BB**

- 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 and Mrs Armitage against the decision of Ryedale District Council.
  - The application Ref 17/00892/HOUSE, dated 27 July 2017, was refused by notice dated 3 October 2017.
  - The development proposed is Erection of a two storey side extension and with a single storey carport attached. Also a single storey rear extension.
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a two storey side extension and with a single storey carport attached and a single storey rear extension at 5 Middlecave Drive, Malton YO17 7BB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/00892/HOUSE, dated 27 July 2017, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan, Drawing No 17-1176-1 Existing Dwelling, Drawing No 17-1176-2A Proposed Extensions.
  - 3) No development shall commence until details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.

### **Main Issue**

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area.

### **Reasons**

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached house in a development of other contemporaneous dwellings. The semi-detached dwellings are set in generous plots to the side and rear. At the end of the road are larger detached properties and a school.

4. The appeal site already has a single storey extension to the side leading to the single garage, inset from the front building line. As shown on Drawing No 18-1176-2A, extensions are proposed to the existing dwelling to add a two storey side extension across the full depth of the property drawing level with the front building line. This would lead into a carport that would be set back by a short distance. As shown on the Proposed South Elevation front and rear projections would be added to create the front porch, and single storey rear kitchen extension with a mono pitched roof and rooflights across the width of the existing kitchen. This would not run the full rear width of the dwelling. There would be no window or opening behind the boundary fence facing towards the adjoining semi-detached,. The rear kitchen extension would not be visible in the streetscene because it would be hidden behind the dwellings.
5. As illustrated on the plans, the resulting development would increase the footprint of the appeal site. With regard to the side extension, at ground floor level there are already buildings in place that cover a similar area albeit stopping short of the frontage. However, the extension would be two storey and would have a pitched roof that would tie in to the existing dwelling slightly below and inset from the existing ridgeline. There would be a small inset at first floor level away from the front elevation. Nevertheless, although the insets from the ridgeline and the front elevation would be relatively small, I am satisfied that the design of the extension overall would appear clearly differentiated as an addition to the appeal site.
6. There is a large variety of previous extensions including substantial alterations to the frontages of other semi-detached dwellings in the road, more closely resembling the detached dwellings nearby in terms of size. This pair of semi-detached dwellings is similar at present in terms of subsequent extensions. The proposal would increase the bulk of No 5 and the larger size would distinguish it from the adjoining semi-detached. However, notwithstanding that, the development would not be unacceptable in my view because given that many of the surrounding semi-detached dwellings have completed large side extensions, the proposal would be compatible with the immediate locality and the surrounding area. Therefore this development would not be out of keeping or discordant given its surroundings and would reflect the character of the streetscene.
7. Consequently I conclude that it would not conflict with Policies SP16 and SP20 of the Ryedale District Council Ryedale Plan-Local Plan Strategy 2013, since these aim to secure development that reflects its location.

### **Conclusion**

8. I have imposed conditions in the interests of certainty and to ensure a satisfactory final appearance. I consider that a condition restricting permitted development rights would not be necessary because the circumstances in this case are not exceptional enough to justify its imposition in accordance with the Guidance. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*S Jones*

INSPECTOR