



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2024

by Ryan Cowley MPlan (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/D/24/3348990

20 The Mount, Malton YO17 7ND

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Blades against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZE24/00354/HOUSE.
 - The development proposed is erection of glazed single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. On 12 December 2024, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been significantly amended. As a result, I have not sought further submissions. I will refer to the updated paragraph numbers where necessary in this appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, including the Malton Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a large semi-detached traditional dwelling and its associated curtilage, located on The Mount, at the northern end of the CA. The dwelling has been extended several times, including a recent single storey side extension¹ and replacement detached garage². The plot is generously sized, and the dwelling sits towards the rear, set back from the road.
5. This part of the CA is characterised by large detached and semi-detached traditional houses, of similar age and appearance, set back from the road in spacious plots enclosed behind hedges and stone walls. There is some variation in house types and, over time, there have been incremental additions and alterations, including several examples of detached garages and offshoots. However, viewed from the street, these are typically relatively simple in form, with an ancillary and subservient relationship to their respective host dwelling.

¹ Council Refs 21/01046/HOUSE & 22/00474/HOUSE

² Council Ref 22/00524/HOUSE

6. Overall, the high quality and harmonious appearance of the dwellings and their setting has been well preserved. In traditional proportions, materials and arrangements, the properties along the street therefore make a positive contribution to the significance and overall historic coherence of the CA.
7. The proposal would link the recently constructed single storey side extension and detached garage with a glazed walkway. While it would benefit from a degree of visual permeability due to its design, it would extend the built form along most of the rear boundary, eliminating the space between the host dwelling and the garage. It would also considerably expand the reach of the combined ground floor of the dwelling, increasing its sprawl across the plot.
8. Due to the difference in ground levels, the eaves of the proposed extension would sit lower than those of the existing extension, but appreciably higher than those of the garage. The glazed link would be met by an obtrusive, lead covered, extension to the roof of the garage, which would increase the prominence of the garage within the site. The resulting irregular arrangement of single storey structures and roof forms extending away from the original dwelling would appear contrived and would erode its imposing character.
9. The evidence indicates that, historically, glazed structures were relatively common in this part of the CA. Traditional glasshouses were typically built of cast or wrought iron or lightweight timber. They were used as both additional living space and for the growing of plants indoors. The proposal would however feature an aluminium frame with a lead sheet extension to the garage roof. It would have a long, narrow footprint and principally serve as a bridge between the existing garage and the main house. Its appearance, form and function would thus differ to those of a traditional glasshouse and so it would not contribute to the historic character or significance of the CA.
10. I recognise that the proposal would be set back from the road, behind the front boundary enclosures and hedge, and other structures in the garden area. Nevertheless, I saw on my site visit that the area for the proposed extension is still partly visible from The Mount. In particular, the upper parts of the proposed extension and roof, including the junction with the existing garage, would be visible above and through the driveway access. It would thus have a noticeable impact on the street scene.
11. The appellant has suggested that the proposed extension to the roof of the existing garage could be finished in materials to match those of the existing roof. However, this would not overcome the harm caused by the obtrusive nature of this addition. While a side extension to the garage appears to have been proposed through the previous applications, the evidence indicates that the design of the garage was amended to remove a bicycle store extension, and a subsequent application for similar was refused. In any event, the previous proposal before me did not provide a continuous link to the host dwelling and so is not directly comparable to the appeal scheme.
12. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, including the CA, the preservation or enhancement of which I apportion great weight to. It would therefore not accord with the clear expectations of statute in this respect³.

³ Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

13. The proposal would also be contrary to Policies SP12, SP16 and SP20 of the Ryedale Local Plan Strategy 5 September 2013. These policies, among other provisions, seek to conserve distinctive elements of the historic environment and heritage assets, including conservation areas, and reinforce local distinctiveness by ensuring the location, siting, form, layout and detailed design of new development respects its surrounding context. They also seek to ensure that extensions to existing buildings are appropriate and sympathetic to the character and appearance of the host building, and cumulative impacts are considered.
14. With respect to paragraph 215 of the Framework, less than substantial harm would be caused to the significance of the CA, which is a designated heritage asset. The proposal would appear from the evidence provided to be advantageous to the appellant, however there would be insufficient public benefits to outweigh the identified harm.
15. The Council considers the host dwelling to be a non-designated heritage asset. There is however limited information before me in respect of this matter, and no evidence the site is featured in a local heritage list or the North Yorkshire Historic Environment Record. In the context of paragraph 216 of the Framework, I have thus afforded this limited weight.

Conclusion

16. The appeal proposal conflicts with the development plan, taken as a whole. I have found no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. Consequently, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Ryan Cowley

INSPECTOR