



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2024 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by Chris Forrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/D/24/3349741

15 Springfield Garden, Stokesley, North Yorkshire TS9 5PH

- 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 Valentijn von Morgen against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZB24/00523/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the provision of a support structure for the mounting of PV panels on the south facing gable end of the house. Panels are to be fitted 5m above ground level and an access platform underneath at 2.7m above ground level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal dwelling is a two-storey detached property situated at the end of a cul-de-sac of other similar dwellings with the Stokesley Primary Academy playing field adjacent to the side of the property. The similar styles of properties result in a consistent and harmonious character and appearance to the residential street of Springfield Garden and the wider area.
5. The appeal site itself has a garden area to the rear and side. The proposed structure would occupy the full width of the gable wall to the side and would be two-storey in height.
6. The side gable of the appeal property is clearly visible and prominent to both users of the public right of way adjacent to Northfield Drive and users of the playing field. There are also more angled views from along Springfield Gardens across the playing field. The height of the proposed structure would exceed the existing boundary wall significantly, and as a result the scale of the structure would be highly visible within the locality and would appear as an overly large and dominant form of development which would overwhelm the character of the existing property. Furthermore, the proposal would erode the uniform

design quality I observed within the area, and the use of contrasting materials to the existing dwelling would further exacerbate its prominence. As a result, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area.

7. The Domestic Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2009) references that renewable sources of energy should be utilised in an appropriate manner. Whilst renewables sources such as PV panels are encouraged, such a provision does not justify the harm to the character and appearance of the area which would conflict with the main aim of the SPD which is encouraging good design.
8. In summary, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and as a result would conflict with the requirements of Policy E1 of the Hambleton Local Plan (2022) and the SPD which both mutually seek to ensure new development is appropriate within its locality.

Other Matters

9. The Appellant has set out that the structure is required on the south facing gable of the house as the existing roof space is not sufficient to generate the power required. However, very little evidence has been provided to substantiate this. I therefore give this very limited weight in my recommendation.
10. In addition to the above, it is suggested there is great support for the proposals. Whilst this may well be the case, there have been no letters of support received. Notwithstanding that, even if such letters of support had been received, it is unlikely that they would outweigh the significant harm I have identified above.
11. As part of the appeal submission the Appellant has indicated that they are open to any suggestions to make the proposal more aesthetically pleasing. However, the appeal process should not be used as a means to evolve a scheme and what is before me should be what the Council issued a determination on. Any changes should be addressed with a fresh application to the Council in the first instance.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence, and my representative's report, and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR