



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 April 2023

by A Caines BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V0728/D/23/3319097

Eastrifts, Victoria Terrace, Saltburn-by-the-Sea TS12 1JE

- 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 H Armstrong against the decision of Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council.
 - The application Ref R/2022/0807/CA, dated 31 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is extension to detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Saltburn Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The Saltburn Conservation Area (CA) contains a number of character areas which contribute to its distinctive identity as a planned Victorian town. The appeal site is located within the Arcadian Villas character area, on the fringes of the CA overlooking the glen. This area has a 'garden suburb' character with larger detached houses and villas set within spacious and well-wooded gardens.
4. In determining this appeal, I have a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. This duty is reflected in Policy HE1 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan 2018 (the LP). In addition, Policy SD4 of the LP requires development to respect or enhance the character of the site and its surroundings in terms of its massing, size, materials, and design, amongst other things.
5. Eastrifts is located at the corner of Victoria Terrace with Upleatham Street. Although it is a relatively modern development, it is reflective of the established character of large properties set within spacious, verdant plots, and has been designed in a traditional style in keeping with older properties in the area. In these regards, it contributes to the special character of the CA as a designated heritage asset, and hence to its significance.
6. The existing detached garage is located to the side of the house, close to the wall along the Upleatham Street boundary. Presenting a steep gable reaching to approximately 7 metres in height, it is already an imposing building within the street scene and is not typical of other outbuildings in the vicinity which tend to be much smaller and less prominent. While there are some mature

trees along the roadside boundaries, the height of the canopies is such that they offer very little screening. I also note the intention for some of these trees to be removed under a separate s211 notification made to the Council.

7. The proposal involves adding a large forward projection at ninety degrees to the existing garage, roughly doubling its size. Though the roof of the new projecting element would slope away from the road, the overall scale of the building would have considerable visual bulk and mass. The result would be an uncharacteristically large outbuilding with an even more imposing presence. It would be unacceptably dominant within the street scene and would erode the spatial quality of the area. Furthermore, whilst it would remain functionally linked to the main house, it would be far less subordinate in visual terms, detracting from the importance of the main house as the primary building on the plot. This would be particularly evident from the east where it would dominate views of the main house. It would also result in most of the gap between, with the views of trees through it, being lost in that view, to the further detriment of the spatial and visual qualities of the area. These harmful impacts would not be mitigated by use of appropriate architectural detailing and matching materials.
8. It has been suggested that some new tree planting could be introduced at the side of the building to soften its appearance, but from my observations I'm not convinced there is sufficient space for any meaningful planting to be achieved. In any event, landscaping should not be used to hide harmful development. Nor can its retention be guaranteed in perpetuity, as it can die, or become diseased, for reasons that are outside the landowner's control.
9. My attention has been drawn to examples in the wider area where buildings are located close to the road. However, none are experienced in the same context as the appeal site, such that they exert limited influence on the site. In addition, some of the examples referred to relate to the main house and therefore the situations are not directly comparable. Consequently, these examples have little bearing on my assessment of the appeal scheme.
10. For all these reasons, I conclude that the development would have an adverse visual effect on the site and its surroundings, and consequently would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA as a whole. Whilst the harm to the CA can be classed as less than substantial in the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), this is nevertheless a matter of considerable importance and weight. The private benefits of the scheme, including additional garaging and storage space, do not come anywhere near to outweighing the harm that would be caused to the CA. Thus, the proposal fails to satisfy the statutory requirements, and the Framework with regards to conserving and enhancing the historic environment. It is also contrary to the design and heritage requirements of LP Policies HD1 and SD4.

Conclusion

11. I have found that the proposal fails to accord with the relevant policies of the development plan and the Framework. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR