



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 June 2021

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W9500/D/21/3272590

Kirkdale, Whitby Road, Easington TS13 4NW

- 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 Mrs Schlomit Lowe against the decision of North York Moors National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NYM/2020/0201/FL, dated 19 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 29 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is Annexe extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Main Issues

2. The main issues of the proposal are:
 - Whether or not it would effect the character and appearance of the building taken as a whole, and the setting of the Easington War Memorial; and
 - Whether or not it would effect highway safety.

Reasons

Character and appearance of building and effect on war memorial

3. The appeal property forms part of a former Victorian school building that has been split laterally in two, and converted equally into two residential dwellings with many original external features apparent. It remains recognised as a Victorian school building. The building was designed with much symmetry and the site still retains its symmetry and historical integrity as its original school purpose. The site is set back from Whitby Road with the main garden to the front of both houses.
4. A war memorial is located adjacent to the appeal site and occupies an elevated position set within its own landscaped grounds. It is described by the Authority as a non-designated heritage asset.
5. The outbuilding at the appeal site, a former toilet block, is stone in construction with a pitched slate roof and located behind a stone wall and set in what I would broadly refer to as a courtyard arrangement. Whilst it is set back into the site, the distinctive roof is visible from above the existing stone wall and seen from the public domain. It is read as part of the original building as it was

associated with the former school building and appears as a subservient outbuilding.

6. The proposal would demolish the outbuilding and infill the courtyard area and join up to the existing kitchen and dining room, utilizing the stone wall to the front, with a flat roof above the complete entity.
7. The amended plans submitted demonstrate that the existing stone wall would be increased in height. This would be a noticeable change to the appearance of the property and its original character.
8. More significantly though would be the loss to symmetry to the original building. This is due to the removal of the outbuilding with its distinguished pitched roof. This would unbalance the property and harmfully distort its symmetry. Even though the building is offered no formal heritage protection, the proposed extension would fail to reflect the symmetry that is a characteristic feature of the original school building.
9. Whilst the west facing window to the proposal may have some limited effect on the significance of the non-designated heritage asset, in the first instance I have found harm would arise to the character of the original property taken as a whole.
10. An extension as proposed may meet the appellant's family needs in better living conditions. However, that is not to say an alternative extension to the property could not be sought by the appellant. Although the existing outbuilding may require some remedial attention, there is nothing before me to demonstrate it has 'little practical use'. The building may be able to be demolished under permitted development. However, as is required of me, I have assessed the proposal based on what is before me on the submitted plans and what I have viewed on site.
11. To conclude, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the building taken as a whole, and fail to create a high quality and positive design. Therefore, the proposal would not reflect the requirements of Policies A and C of the North York Moors National Park Authority Local Plan July 2020 (LP).

Highway Safety

12. There is no incurtilage parking available at the site and on-street parking is problematic due to the existing road junction arrangements and bus stop locations. There is no incurtilage parking proposed as part of the proposal, and parking for the existing occupants occurs elsewhere. It is stated that parking would continue to occur on that basis.
13. It would be expected that the proposed annexe extension, intended for use by family members, would bring additional vehicles to the site.
14. It has not been adequately demonstrated that parking could be made available elsewhere. To that end, without this information, the proposal would cause stress for on-street parking on this junction that would lead to a highway safety concern.
15. To conclude, there is no evidence provided of alternative parking and therefore the proposal would lead to the detriment of highway safety. It would therefore conflict with the requirements of LP Policy CO2 which requires development to

be of a scale which the adopted road network has the capacity to serve without detriment to highway safety.

Conclusion

16. As I have found the proposal to negatively impact upon the character and appearance of the building as a whole, and lead to highway safety concerns, this is 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