



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 January 2021

by E Symmons BSc (Hons) MSc MArborA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V0728/D/20/3262796

199 High Street, Marske-by-the-Sea TS11 7LN

- 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 D Dallin against the decision of Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council.
 - The application Ref R/2020/0362/CA, dated 9 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of Marske-by-the-Sea Conservation Area (MCA).

Reasons

3. This two-storey end-terrace property sits within MCA. The terraced properties which line this western side of High Street, have a simple design with gable-ended slate pitched roofs. This particular part of MCA has an open character due to the presence of green space at Marske Valley Gardens. These sit in a narrow, steep-sided valley to the front of the property and when seen from this green space, the terrace is seen in an elevated position. Similarly, when viewed from The Headlands opposite, it is a prominent feature against the skyline.
4. No 199 is at the end of a short terrace and separated from the adjacent block by Valley Close. Valley Close leads behind the terrace to a small residential development and to further residential properties to the rear of High Street. When viewed from the rear, various different styles of extension are present. However, except for of No 193 which has a relatively shallow rear dormer, roof extensions are uncommon. Consequently, within rear views, the terrace retains its simple roofline, interrupted only by chimneys and the occasional roof-lights.
5. The proposal would place a large dormer over almost the entire roof area. It would be close to the gable end and therefore visible from High Street due to the gap valley view gives between terrace blocks. The Appellant would be willing to decrease the width of the dormer to provide a 0.5m gap from the gable edge. This would follow guidance within the Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD 2013 and lessen the dormer's impact when seen from High Street. However, even with a set-back, and at 2m high, the dormer would still

- represent a large and incongruous feature which would dominate the roof and rear views of this part of the terrace.
6. Although there are rooflights present on some terrace roofs, these are very much in the minority and there are no other large rooflights on the front elevation of this particular terrace. The proposed velux cabrio balcony rooflight, despite its relatively flush design, would be an incongruous feature even when closed. When in use, it would form a large opening with a pop-up front guard-rail. This would be highly visible and an incongruous feature which would significantly harm the character and appearance of MCA. The Appellant has expressed a willingness to alter its design however, no substantive alternatives are before me. I can therefore give little weight to this suggestion.
 7. Although in scale the proposal would be no greater than other three storey houses present in the area, this form of development would not be appropriate within the context of the existing terrace. Consequently, the proposed combination of a cabrio balcony velux rooflight and large rear dormer, would significantly harm the character and appearance of MCA.
 8. As the appeal site lies within a conservation area, Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, requires that special attention is paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. No 199 makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the designated heritage asset and the harm this proposal would have to the significance of MCA would be 'less than substantial'. Paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset such as MCA, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. That is still so, irrespective of whether the potential harm is 'less than substantial'.
 9. In accordance with paragraph 196 of the Framework, the public benefit must be balanced against any harm found. The proposal is expected to improve the property's available living space, which would be a private benefit for the Appellant. Consequently, there would be almost no public benefit to outweigh the harm found to MCA.
 10. In conclusion, the proposal would harm rather than preserve or enhance the character and appearance of MCA. This would conflict with Policy SD 4 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan 2018 (Local Plan) which amongst other matters, seeks that development responds to, respects or enhances the local character of the surrounding area. With respect to conservation areas, Policy HE 1 has a similar aim seeking that proposals preserve or enhance the conservation area's character or appearance.
 11. For the reasons stated above, the appeal is dismissed.

E Symmons

INSPECTOR