



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2019

by C Coyne BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/H2733/W/19/3236292

1 Goldenfields, Scalby, Scarborough YO13 0PH

- 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 Paul Harrison against the decision of Scarborough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00026/FL, dated 24 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 1 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is within the existing curtilage of no. 1 Goldenfields and is currently occupied by an attached single storey garage and extension to this property. The surrounding area is predominately residential with most dwellings in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site comprising sizeable detached dwellings with substantial plots and large gardens. There are also many mature trees in the area around Goldenfields which in combination with the established development pattern of mostly larger plots contribute to the leafy suburban character of the area. The site also abuts the Scalby Conservation Area (CA) the boundary of which lies immediately to the north, east and south of the appeal site.
4. The proposed development would demolish the existing single storey garage/extension to the eastern end of no. 1 replacing it with a detached bungalow thereby sub-dividing the original plot. Consequently, the new plot would be much narrower than those of the other dwellings immediately to the west and east of no.1 and the proposed dwelling would also be much longer and narrower than any of these adjacent dwellings. As a result, the proposal would represent a cramped form of development out of keeping with the established pattern of development in the locality.
5. I note the point made by the appellant that there are several properties on narrower plots further to the east (at the junction of North Street and High Street). However, these are located within a part of the adjacent CA with a very different character and development pattern to that of Goldenfields. Indeed, the appellant has acknowledged that the existing (and more recent) Goldenfields development

has been 'purposefully laid out to provide substantial plots for large detached dwellings', which is something that the proposed development would be at odds with.

6. I also note the appellant's points that the proposed dwelling would be largely within the development footprint of the existing garage/extension and that from the front it would appear no different in terms of its design, materials and massing. However, the proposed detached bungalow would project much further back than the existing garage/extension and be set within a very narrow plot thereby having a greater visual impact than a more modest single storey extension.
7. Accordingly, I do not consider the proposal to be a 'minor alteration to the front' of no. 1 or that the property would look 'exactly the same' as when it was first built as the appellant has asserted. Consequently, (and notwithstanding the fact that Goldenfields is on a private and relatively secluded road) I consider that the proposed development would be a discordant addition to the street scene and consequently also cause harm to the character and appearance of the area in this regard.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would conflict with Policy DEC1 of the Scarborough Borough Local Plan (adopted July 2017) which seeks to ensure that the design of new development proposals respond positively to local context in terms of their form and layout, amongst other considerations. It would also conflict with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) which promotes good design.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Coyne

INSPECTOR