



The Planning Inspectorate

Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Direct Line: 03034445273
Customer Services:
0303 444 5000

Email:
NSI.HAS@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate

Your Ref: NYM/2019/0640/FL
Our Ref: APP/W9500/D/19/3243220

Mrs Wendy Strangeway
North York Moors National Park Authority
Development Control Support Officer
The Old Vicarage
Bondgate
Helmsley
York
YO62 5BP

23 March 2020

Dear Mrs Strangeway,

Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Appeal by Mr Charles Davies
Site Address: Little Shortwaite , Lealholm, WHITBY, YO21 2AA

I enclose a copy of our Inspector's decision on the above appeal(s).

If you have queries or feedback about the decision or the way we handled the appeal(s), you should submit them using our "Feedback" webpage at <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/planning-inspectorate/about/complaints-procedure>.

If you do not have internet access please write to the Customer Quality Unit at the address above.

If you would prefer hard copies of our information on the right to challenge and our feedback procedure, please contact our Customer Service Team on 0303 444 5000.

Please note the Planning Inspectorate is not the administering body for High Court challenges. If you would like more information on the strictly enforced deadlines for challenging, or a copy of the forms for lodging a challenge, please contact the Administrative Court on 020 7947 6655.

The Planning Inspectorate cannot change or revoke the outcome in the attached decision. If you want to alter the outcome you should consider obtaining legal advice as only the High Court can quash this decision.

We are continually seeking ways to improve the quality of service we provide to our customers. As part of this commitment we are seeking feedback from those who use our service. It would be appreciated if you could take some time to complete this short survey, which should take no more than a few minutes complete:

https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/Planning_inspectorate_customer_survey

Thank you in advance for taking the time to provide us with valuable feedback.

Yours sincerely,

Jade McNamara

Jade McNamara

Where applicable, you can use the internet to submit documents, to see information and to check the progress of cases through GOV.UK. The address of the search page is - <https://www.gov.uk/appeal-planning-inspectorate>



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2020

by E Maund BA (Hons) MSc Dip UP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W9500/D/19/3243220

Little Shortwaite, Leaholm, Whitby YO21 2AA

- 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 Charles Davies against the decision of North York Moors National Park.
 - The application Ref NYM/2019/0640/FL, dated 18 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing single storey extension and construction of a two-storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Issue

2. In the interests of clarity, I have used the description from the Appellant's appeal form in the banner headline above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the existing property and the wider area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an attractive stone house with pantile roof. Sitting below the level of the road it is accessed from, but clearly visible from it, being an isolated property set in undulating countryside.
5. The dwelling is located in the north western corner of the appeal site within a restricted garden, enclosed by low stone walls and a post and wire fence to the rear, forming the shared boundary with the field beyond. To the south part of the same site is a stable and wood store.
6. The current property is a simple utilitarian design being linear in plan form, with a narrow span and steep pitched roof, the eastern end of the building being single storey with matching details to the main building.
7. The extension, the subject of this appeal would introduce a significant addition which would change the simple plan form and create a somewhat ungainly addition to the host building.

8. The extension would be visible from both the road and a public footpath which connects to the road opposite the site entrance. Despite the ridge line being set below that of the main house, the depth of the extension and lower pitch of roof for the rear element would create a large and incongruous addition which would dominate the original property.
9. I recognise that the front elevation would only be visible from distant or oblique views and is to a large extent shielded by the stable building to the south. The introduction of the large window opening on the front elevation, however, would draw the eye and make this a prominent feature on this principle elevation.
10. Whilst lowering the ridge and setting the front elevation back from the original are positive steps, they are not enough in themselves to make the extension subservient to the original dwelling.
11. Despite the use of sympathetic materials and being set back from the road and avoidance of overlooking other dwellings, the bulk of the proposal would be prominent and dominate the original dwelling. Whilst reasonably localised in its extent, the effect of the scheme would be to diminish unacceptably the character and appearance of the host dwelling with consequent harm to the character and appearance of the area.
12. The appeal scheme would thereby run contrary to the principles of the North York Moors Core Strategy and Development Policies No. 3 and No. 19 (2008) and the North York Moors Design Guide Part 2, which seek to ensure that new developments preserve or enhance views into and out of sites and the scale, massing, proportion, form, and design features are compatible with the original dwelling or its setting in the landscape.

Other Issues

13. The appellant has referred me to a number of other extensions granted permission in the area. I am, however, not aware of the full circumstances in these cases and in any event, I must consider the appeal scheme on its own merits. The existence of apparently similar development in the locality does not overcome the harm I have identified.

Conclusions

14. For the reasons set out, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Edwin Maund

INSPECTOR