



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 May 2021

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/G2713/W/21/3267250

Cleveland Nurseries, 46 Station Road, Stokesley TS9 7AA

- 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 R Bezemer against the decision of Hambleton District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02264/FUL, dated 8 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as Proposed second floor extension and roof dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development set out in the Banner Heading above is taken from the planning application form. This was amended by the Council, and the Decision Notice describes the proposal as 'Proposed second floor extension and roof dormers linked to application 19/02197/FUL - Construction of 2no dwellinghouses with associated garages and vehicle parking'. The appellant also refers to this earlier planning permission on the appeal form. I have therefore considered the appeal in that context.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Plot 1 is currently undeveloped and is located within Hambleton Gate, a small residential development of four other modern houses. The site is located off Station Road close to the centre of Stokesley. Station Road has built development to both sides of the road of a mixed character, made up of residential dwellings, a primary school and commercial buildings.
5. Plot 1 was originally proposed and approved planning permission as a two-storey dwelling. Whilst of its own individual and traditional design, the originally approved scale and proportions of the dwelling would be more akin to those of the adjacent houses of No's 3, 4 and 5 Hambleton Gate.

6. The proposal before me seeks to increase the height of the dwelling to create a two and a half storey dwelling incorporating dormer windows within the roof. The dormers would align with the fenestration below and, in support of the scheme, the appellant explains they have used Council design advice. Nonetheless, the roof would appear proportionately out of scale with the rest of the proposed dwelling. It would result in a large-scale and bulky, top heavy feature, further emphasized by the inclusion of dormer windows.
7. In addition, the external chimney stack proposed to the side of the dwelling would also be increased in height to clear the ridge line. This would result in a very tall and obtrusive feature.
8. Integral dormer windows are a characteristic of Hambleton Gate. However, these are located within a different house type and situated above the garage roofs at lower level, and not within the main roof slope of the dwelling. These dwellings cannot be compared to the appeal proposal before me.
9. Furthermore, taking into account the proposal's relationship with the adjacent unit of No 5 that sides onto the main road, its setting in context with these dwellings and its position facing the main road, it would appear more visually prominent and discordant within the street scene. Nor would it relate to the dwelling at Number 46 Station Road given the separation distances and the fact that this is a very different house type, and has a greater set-back from the road than the appeal proposal.
10. There may be a mixed residential character to the street scene and the Stokesley area, and the examples provided by the appellant demonstrates this. However, I am not convinced that the other examples share precisely the same characteristics as the appeal proposal. Other modern houses brought to my attention are located in a larger, planned housing development and are not the same context as the one before me. In any case, I have considered the proposal in its own particular context, and reached my own findings on the matter.
11. With all these factors in mind, the proposal would create a discordant and visually intrusive form of development, resulting in harm arising to the character and appearance of the area.
12. Although the Council refers to the harm to the adjoining countryside, notwithstanding my findings above, the proposal would be seen in a context of other housing. I do not find that this specific proposal would lead to a discernible change that would result in harm to the character of the countryside.
13. To conclude, given its overall scale and massing, the proposal would result in harm arising to the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to the Hambleton Core Strategy 2007 (CS) Policy CP17 in its aims to secure high quality design, and contrary to the same aims of Policy DP32 of the Hambleton Development Plan Document, Development Policies 2008 (DPDDP). Finally, it would conflict with criteria 2 of the Interim Policy Guidance 2005 (IPG) to reflect existing built form and character.
14. I find no conflict with DPDDP Policy DP30 as this relates to protecting the character and appearance of the countryside, or criteria 2 of the IPG for the same reasons. Furthermore, there is nothing before me to reach a view that

the proposal would have a harmful effect on natural and man-made assets. Therefore, I find no conflict with CS Policy CP16.

Other Matters

15. No objections may have been received to the proposal and there may be no impacts of it on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. However, the absence of harm in these respects is a neutral matter which weighs neither for nor against the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

16. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area in conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR