
Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 16 August 2021

by Sarah Housden BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H2733/D/21/3278500

Southfield, Main Street, Flixton, SCARBOROUGH, YO11 3UD

- 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 and Mrs C and M Sterriker against the decision of Scarborough Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01066/HS, dated 23 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is 'Erection of two storey extensions to south and west elevations, raising height of existing bungalow roof to form a 2 storey dwelling and alterations to roof'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021. Paragraph 218 indicates that its policies are material considerations which should be taken into account in dealing with applications from the day of publication. The principal parties were therefore invited to comment on any implications of the revised Framework for this appeal but did not submit any comments. I have determined the appeal having regard to the revised Framework.
3. The description of the proposed development in the banner heading above is taken from the decision notice and the appeal form.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is located to the south of the A1039 (Main Street), within the dispersed, linear development to the west of the main built up area of Flixton. The majority of dwellings, including the appeal dwelling, have a modest and unobtrusive character and appearance due to their single storey height and simple hipped roof form. The two storey dwelling 'Ponderosa' to the east of the appeal site is an exception to this, but due to its position well set back from the road it does not appear unduly prominent or intrusive in the street scene. Agricultural and commercial uses are generally accommodated in larger scale buildings set back from the road.

6. Development along Main Street is dispersed and the predominant view of the dwellings to the south of the road, including Southfield Farm to the west, is of their roofs projecting above the roadside hedges. Due to their position set back from and at a lower level than the road, the dwellings to the north are low key and unobtrusive, contributing to the rural character of the surroundings.
7. The appeal dwelling is at a slightly higher level than the road and is enclosed by a fence and mixed hawthorn hedge to the road frontage and by established hedges on the west, south and east boundaries. It is set within a generously sized plot and the proposed extensions could be accommodated without appearing cramped or out of scale with the plot.
8. However, the additional floor area to the side of the existing flat roof extension combined with the first floor extension would result in a substantial increase in the dwelling's bulk, height and massing. The dwelling would have a wide, elongated form with a horizontal emphasis. Although the gabled roof would reflect the existing front gable, the latter is subordinate in appearance to the dwelling's predominantly hipped roof form which would be lost. Overall, the proposed extensions would fail to respect the unobtrusive and modest character and appearance of the existing dwelling.
9. When approaching from longer distances in either direction on Main Street, views of the dwelling would be partially screened by the existing boundary hedges. However, the first floor walls and roof would project above the frontage hedge and at closer distances, the dwelling would have an unduly dominant and conspicuous appearance. This would be at odds with the low key and unobtrusive character of surrounding development and would be harmful to the rural character of the area.
10. The harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area would be in conflict with Policy DEC1 of the Scarborough Local Plan (2017) (LP) which requires development to respond positively to the local context in terms of its scale, form and height. There would be further conflict with the advice in the Residential Extensions Supplementary Planning Guidance (2002) (SPG) that the design of an extension should respect the shape, roof pitch and scale of the original building and should normally be subservient to it. The SPG is consistent with the Framework's guidance to secure good design and is a material consideration in the determination of the appeal. There would also be conflict with the Framework's provision that new development should be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and add to the overall quality of an area.
11. The appeal decision for Southfield Farm¹ adjacent to the appeal site which has been referred to me by the appellant refers to a proposed single storey front extension which is not comparable with the appeal proposal. The appellant has also referred to an appeal decision for a two storey extension at the Old School House², but that property is located approximately 0.8 kilometres to the east and the appeal dwelling would not be viewed in conjunction with it. As such, the context of that site is not comparable with the case before me.

¹ Appeal Reference APP/H2733/D/09/2115478

² Appeal Reference APP/H2733/D/13/2191418

Other matters

12. I have considered that the proposal would provide the flexibility for additional accommodation to meet the needs of a family member and that this would be of benefit to the appellants. However, these are personal circumstances which can change over time. Accordingly, I do not consider that the circumstances advanced in this case are of sufficient weight to outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area and the conflict with LP Policy DEC1 in this regard.
13. For the reasons outlined above and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Housden

INSPECTOR