



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 October 2020 by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/H2733/D/20/3257430

1 Metropole Towers, Argyle Road, Whitby YO21 3HU

- 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 Miss D Sigsworth against the decision of Scarborough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00738/HS, dated 8 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is construction of a porch to the main entrance on the west elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. Revised drawings were submitted prior to the determination of the planning application and the Council considered those drawings. For the avoidance of doubt, I have considered the appeal on the basis of the revised drawings.

Main Issues

4. These are:
 - i. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area; and
 - ii. The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 1, with particular reference to light.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal relates to a former hotel which has been converted to apartments and commercial uses. The building is prominent within the surrounding area, due to its imposing scale and massing, its symmetry and distinctive architectural features. Notwithstanding the historic alterations it makes a

positive contribution to the area. Within the local area there are a range of architectural styles.

6. The scheme would provide an extension to an existing apartment. The appellant asserts that the extension has been designed to be sympathetic to the architectural style and detailing of the original building through the use of brickwork, brick cills and decorative cornice detailing to the crown.
7. The extension would be adjacent to a bay window which is also a feature towards the south western corner. The principal and eastern elevation also have two bay windows. These bay windows are integral to the symmetry of the building and result in a unified appearance between the elevations.
8. The height of the proposed porch would be significantly lower than the bay window and would appear out of keeping with the height of the originally built ground floor. In addition, the height of the porch would be above the mid brick transom of the bay window to the front and western elevation. The scheme would therefore appear disjointed and not respect the proportions of the building.
9. The scale of the porch would be significantly smaller than the building and it would appear squat in comparison to the much grander scale of the adjacent bay windows and the property as a whole. Given that the porch is proposed towards the north western corner of the building, it would be conspicuous from public vantage points and from North Promenade which is a popular walking route. Accordingly, due to its siting and height, the scheme would detract from the design of the ground floor and symmetry of the building. It would result in a harmful addition to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.
10. I recognise that the building has been amended over the years and alterations such as the conservatory, polycarbonate roof and advertising do not reflect the character and appearance of the building. I do not know the circumstances that led to these proposals being accepted and it appears from the evidence submitted that these were granted prior to the current local and national planning policy. I also acknowledge that the scheme would screen the existing uPVC patio doors. However, the presence of other unsympathetic alterations should not dictate that further harmful development should be allowed which would degrade the character of the building. Consequently, these considerations do not outweigh the harm identified.
11. For these reasons, the proposed development would be visually harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. The scheme would conflict with Policy DEC1 of the Scarborough Borough Local Plan (2017) (LP) which seeks, amongst other matters, to promote good design which responds positively to the local context.

Living Conditions

12. Whilst not referred to in the reasons for refusal, the Council states in the officer's report that the scheme would take natural light away from the bay window to the detriment of present and future occupiers of No. 1.
13. Given that the porch would be to the north of the west facing bay window the scheme would not have an unacceptable effect upon daylight. The bay window

would continue to provide suitable levels of light. I am satisfied that there would be no undue impact in that regard.

14. For those reasons, the proposed development would not have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of the occupants of No. 1, with particular reference to light. Accordingly, it would not conflict with Policy DEC4 of the LP which seeks, amongst other matters, to ensure existing and future occupiers are provided with a good standard of amenity.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. Although I have found that the development would not have an unacceptable effect upon the occupiers of No. 1, the scheme would be visually harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and area to which I attach significant weight. For those reasons I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

L M Wilson

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I agree and conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR