
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 July 2022

by H Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W9500/W/22/3296345

Laneside, Can Bridge to Hurstville, Glaisdale, Whitby YO21 2QX

- 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 Stephen Simpson against the decision of North York Moors National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref NYM/2022/0055, dated 27 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is change of use of existing bed and breakfast room within dwelling plus a single storey extension to form a holiday letting unit together with the re-cladding of part of the existing dwelling rear and side walls.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

3. Laneside is a detached bed and breakfast property located within a rural area. The elevations of the property are constructed of a mixture of lightly coloured painted render and tooled stonework with a red pantile roof. This type of roof covering and stonework is a feature of the local area.
4. The National Park Authority's two Local Development Framework Design Guide Supplementary Planning Documents (Parts 1 and 2), (SPDs) collectively advise that the design and materiality of development should complement the property and area though emphasise that innovative design should not be stifled.
5. The development would result in a significant proportion of existing tooled stonework being timber clad and part of the pantile roof re-covered with a bituminous membrane. Though the garage serving the property has timber elevations which, as well as other means of cladding, may well be utilised elsewhere in the area, this does not justify the particular approach in this case. The existing tooled stonework and red pantiles which the host property exhibits are very characteristic of the area. I find that their replacement and cladding with a more atypical approach would detract from the property.
6. Furthermore, the lounge/dining and kitchen extension would have a flat roof. Adjacent, the retained pitched pantile roof of the existing letting room would be present, so too would the retained pitched roof of the existing garden room

though with the bituminous membrane. I find that this variety in roof form and materiality would be incoherent.

7. The combined effects of the extensive timber cladding and the ground floor roof form that would result from the development would be harmful.
8. Due to the relatively secluded location of the property, the development would not be widely visible. However, that does not remove the requirement for the development to be an appropriately designed amendment to the property.
9. As a result, I find that the proposal would not represent high quality design nor complement the existing building and would be contrary to Strategic Policy C of the North York Moors National Park Authority Local Plan (2020) (LP) together with the detailed design guidance contained within the SPDs. Given this harm would not extend widely enough to detract from the broader landscape character of the area, I do not find conflict with Strategic Policy J of the LP. Neither have I found conflict with Strategic Policy UE1 of the LP, the content of which, on my reading, is largely irrelevant to the specific design related harm I have identified.

Other Matters

10. I note the water ingress issues the existing roof may have and there may well be constraints on remedying this. However, the proposal before me has not been shown to be the only option to alter the property so I give this matter limited weight.
11. Local economic benefits from the proposed holiday letting unit may well result and the Framework does seek to support a prosperous rural economy, advising at paragraph 84 that planning decisions should enable the sustainable growth and expansion of businesses in rural areas. However, this is subject to being of good design and the benefits emerging from the development do not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, the proposal would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There have been no material considerations put to me that would be worthy of sufficient weight to indicate a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

H Jones

INSPECTOR