



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2025

by F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W9500/D/25/3368332

9 Twizziegill View, Easington TS13 4NX

- 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 Ms Donna Wiseman against the decision of North York Moors National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref is NYM/2025/0225.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and single storey rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including the appeal property.

Reasons

3. The appeal site accommodates a detached dwelling within a residential street. Despite some differences in appearance, the appeal property forms part of a relatively uniform row of detached dwellings with front dormers. The similarity in the general scale of the built form creates a sense of balance and a harmonious character and appearance that contributes positively to the area.
4. The appeal site is within the North York Moors National Park (NYMNP), a designated landscape of national importance which attracts the highest status of protection. Paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires great weight to be given to conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty of national parks. As the proposal would affect land within the NYMNP I am mindful of the duty to seek to further its purposes, which includes conserving its natural beauty and cultural heritage. The NYMNP is characterised, amongst other things, by the variety and quality of its landscapes, the distinctive character of its settlements and the way in which these factors interact.
5. The proposal would extend the appeal property to the side and rear to provide additional living accommodation. Despite the use of materials to match which would help to assimilate the proposal with the appeal property and the surrounding area, the scale of the proposed extensions and alterations are such that they would not be subservient to the existing property. The ridge height of the two-storey side extension in combination with the projection forward of the main elevation would not complement the architectural character and form of the appeal property. Consequently, the proposal would not meet the provisions of the Design Guide Part

- 2: Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings Supplementary Planning Document (2008) which advises that side extensions should be set back from the front of the house with a lower roof height to retain architectural integrity and subservience with the original building.
6. It is not disputed that the proposal would result in more than a 30% increase in habitable floorspace. I have carefully considered the appellant's need to extend the appeal property to enhance its functionality and sustainability which is said to allow the appellant's growing family to remain within the NYMNP. However, this is a largely private matter and therefore does not amount to a compelling planning consideration in favour of a larger extension, as required by Policy CO17 of the North York Moors National Park Authority Local Plan (2020) (LP).
 7. Irrespective of the precise numerical increase in floorspace, the overall bulk and scale of the proposal would unbalance the prevailing character and appearance of the area, and it would not relate positively to the modest scale and generally consistent design of the surrounding dwellings. In particular, the proposed number, size and arrangement of window openings would be at odds with the existing rhythm of fenestration in the area and would not be sympathetic to either the appeal property or the predominant elevation treatment along the street. It would therefore have an awkward presence in the street scene.
 8. I have considered the other examples of extensions and alterations nearby. From my site visit I found these to have a different built form and relationship with their respective original property in comparison to the proposal before me. As such, they do not undermine the character and appearance of the area in the way that the proposal would. The examples provided do not therefore lead me away from my above findings.
 9. Overall, the proposal would result in a marked visual change that would detract from the otherwise harmonious character and appearance of the area. In doing so it would fail to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the NYMNP and would therefore undermine the statutory purposes for which it is designated. Consequently, the proposal would not seek to further the statutory purposes of the national park.
 10. To conclude, the proposal would be unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the area, including the appeal property and would be in conflict with Strategic Policy C and Policy CO17 of the LP. Amongst other things, these policies require development to be of a high-quality design and the scale, height, form, position and design of householder development to not detract from the character and form of the original dwelling.

Conclusion

11. My above findings bring the proposal into conflict with the development plan, read as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Harrison

INSPECTOR