
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2020

by E Maund BA (Hons) MSc Dip UP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W9500/D/19/3243220

Little Shortwaite, Leaholm, Whitby YO21 2AA

- 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 Charles Davies against the decision of North York Moors National Park.
 - The application Ref NYM/2019/0640/FL, dated 18 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing single storey extension and construction of a two-storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Issue

2. In the interests of clarity, I have used the description from the Appellant's appeal form in the banner headline above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the existing property and the wider area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an attractive stone house with pantile roof. Sitting below the level of the road it is accessed from, but clearly visible from it, being an isolated property set in undulating countryside.
5. The dwelling is located in the north western corner of the appeal site within a restricted garden, enclosed by low stone walls and a post and wire fence to the rear, forming the shared boundary with the field beyond. To the south part of the same site is a stable and wood store.
6. The current property is a simple utilitarian design being linear in plan form, with a narrow span and steep pitched roof, the eastern end of the building being single storey with matching details to the main building.
7. The extension, the subject of this appeal would introduce a significant addition which would change the simple plan form and create a somewhat ungainly addition to the host building.

8. The extension would be visible from both the road and a public footpath which connects to the road opposite the site entrance. Despite the ridge line being set below that of the main house, the depth of the extension and lower pitch of roof for the rear element would create a large and incongruous addition which would dominate the original property.
9. I recognise that the front elevation would only be visible from distant or oblique views and is to a large extent shielded by the stable building to the south. The introduction of the large window opening on the front elevation, however, would draw the eye and make this a prominent feature on this principle elevation.
10. Whilst lowering the ridge and setting the front elevation back from the original are positive steps, they are not enough in themselves to make the extension subservient to the original dwelling.
11. Despite the use of sympathetic materials and being set back from the road and avoidance of overlooking other dwellings, the bulk of the proposal would be prominent and dominate the original dwelling. Whilst reasonably localised in its extent, the effect of the scheme would be to diminish unacceptably the character and appearance of the host dwelling with consequent harm to the character and appearance of the area.
12. The appeal scheme would thereby run contrary to the principles of the North York Moors Core Strategy and Development Policies No. 3 and No. 19 (2008) and the North York Moors Design Guide Part 2, which seek to ensure that new developments preserve or enhance views into and out of sites and the scale, massing, proportion, form, and design features are compatible with the original dwelling or its setting in the landscape.

Other Issues

13. The appellant has referred me to a number of other extensions granted permission in the area. I am, however, not aware of the full circumstances in these cases and in any event, I must consider the appeal scheme on its own merits. The existence of apparently similar development in the locality does not overcome the harm I have identified.

Conclusions

14. For the reasons set out, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Edwin Maund

INSPECTOR