

North York Moors National Park Authority

Ward: Scarborough Borough Council (North)
Parish: Egton

App No. NYM/2020/0346/FL
NYM/2020/0346/FL

Proposal: construction of two storey oak garage and home office following demolition of existing garages

Location: Peony Bank Farm, Egton Road, Aislaby,

Applicant: Mr and Mrs Fiddler,
Peony Bank Farm, Egton Road, Aislaby, Whitby, YO21 1SX

Agent: Cheryl Ward Planning,
5 Valley View, Ampleforth, YO62 4DQ

Date for Decision: 17/07/2020

Extended to: 28/08/2020 **Grid Ref:** 484301
508071

Director of Planning's Recommendation

Consultations

Highways – No objections – 16 June 2020

Site Notice/Advertisement Expiry Date – 17 July 2020

Refusal for the following reason(s):

- 1 The proposed development by reason of its scale, in footprint and height, overall massing, bulk and design would detract from the character and form of the original dwelling and its setting within the locality. The varying topography of the site, combined with the proposed height of the development, would result in a building that would be elevated above the existing dwelling and as such would not be clearly subservient to the original dwelling. As such the development is deemed to be contrary to Strategic Policy C and Policy CO17 of the NYM Authority's Adopted Policies and the advice contained within Part 2, Sections 2 and 3.7 of the Authority's adopted Design Guide.

Application Number: NYM/2020/0346/FL





Application Number: NYM/2020/0346/FL

**Background**

Peony Bank Farm backs onto dense woodland and sits within a large curtilage. The two storey dwelling is of stone and pantile construction across split levels, with an existing conservatory on the west elevation and numerous garages and sheds to the east.

The property has a limited planning history with one certificate of lawfulness in respect of non-compliance with agricultural occupancy condition on permission 6/4/2683A for in excess of 10 years and three previous planning applications. Planning application 40320155 relates to a timber double garage which is still present on site. The applicants applied for planning permission in 2020 for the demolition of the existing conservatory and construction of a replacement orangery/conservatory on the west elevation, which was subsequently approved.

This application relates to the construction of a two storey garage and home office building. The proposed building is 5.93m in height, 13m deep and just over 8m in width. It is proposed that the building would be constructed of an oak framed structure with larch cladding over a brick/stone plinth.

Application Number: NYM/2020/0346/FL

Relevant Policy

Policy CO17 states that development within the domestic curtilage of dwellings should only be permitted where the scale, height, form, position and design of the new development does not detract from the character and form of the original dwelling or its setting in the landscape. Any proposed outbuildings should be clearly subservient and should be required for purposes incidental to the residential use of the main dwelling. The policy also states that the development should reflect the principles outlined in the Authority's Design Guide.

Strategic Policy C relates to the quality and design of development within the National Park. The policy seeks to ensure that proposed development maintains and enhances the distinctive character of the National Park through appropriate siting, orientation, layout and density together with carefully considered scale, height, massing and form. Proposals should incorporate good quality construction materials and design details that reflect and complement the architectural character and form of the original building and/or that of the local vernacular.

Main Issues

The scheme for the two storey garage/home office submitted under this application was also submitted under a previous application (NYM/2020/0062/FL). The agent/applicant was advised under the previous application that that the height of the replacement garage should be reduced significantly and that domestic features, such as the first floor gable window, would be unlikely to receive favourable consideration and should be omitted from the plans. No amended plans were submitted and instead the proposed building was withdrawn from the application.

The current application was subsequently submitted proposing an identical scheme to that withdrawn from the previous application. As with NYM/2020/0062/FL the agent/applicant was again advised that the building would be recommended for refusal unless the previously discussed amendments were made. The applicant was then advised more specifically that a reduction in height of the right hand element of the building (when looking at the labelled 'front elevation') above the garage door, would improve the subservience substantially resulting in a scheme more likely to be given favourable consideration. Again the applicant/agent confirmed that they were unwilling to make any of the suggested amendments.

The agent/applicants have explained that they believe the proposed two storey garage/home office would be a visual enhancement on the existing buildings on the site. In the immediate area of proposed development there are two garages/domestic outbuildings of similar size and height, together with a smaller structure to the north of the two larger buildings. Of the three outbuildings present, only one has consent.

Application Number: NYM/2020/0346/FL

It is believed based on the plans submitted that the applicants intend to retain the smaller building to the north and a section of one of the larger sheds to rear of the proposed building, however this is not clear as their supporting statement claims that the two garages will be removed. It is therefore unclear as to why part of this building is shown on the proposed plans.

The existing double bay garage was approved in 1992 but it is unknown when the second similar sized structure was erected; it had been in situ for some time at the point of the application for the double garage. It is acknowledged that the existing garages/outbuildings are of poor quality construction and design. However, whilst they are not reflective of the local vernacular and are of poor construction, they do meet many of the requirements in terms of scale and massing as set out in Part 2 of the Authority's Design Guide. The buildings are low level and therefore do not obstruct the wider views and do not detract from the character or form of the main dwelling. The proposed structure is twice the height of the existing buildings.

Part 2 of the Authority's Design Guide relates to extensions and alterations to dwellings. Section 3.7 of Part 2 of the Design Guide relates more specifically to garages and other outbuildings. The Design Guide highlights that garages are a relatively recent innovation and therefore require careful consideration in terms of siting and design so as not to spoil the character or setting of the main dwelling. The guidance states that garages should be subservient to the main building and should be simple and functional in form. Outbuildings should be clearly ancillary to the main dwelling and should be located in unobtrusive positions in respect of the main dwelling and the surrounding landscape.

It is appreciated that the site is relatively well screened and fairly isolated, preventing an impact on wider views of the development, however the proposals must be assessed in respect of their immediate surroundings also and the relationship with the main dwelling. The site is noticeably sloped with the property sat on split levels. The proposed two storey garage/home office is sat to the north east of the property and whilst stepped back, the development sits at an elevated position. It is not considered that a proposed height of 5.93m combined with the existing topography would result in a building that was clearly subservient to the main dwelling. Furthermore with a depth of just over 13m and a width of 8.5m the building is undoubtedly a considerable size and would visibly appear as such. Policy CO17 clearly states that any new outbuildings should be proportionate in size and clearly subservient to the main dwelling; it is not considered that the proposed development meets this requirement of the policy. Nor does it adhere to the policy requirements in that the proposed development should not detract from the character and form of the original dwelling or its setting in the landscape in terms of scale and height.

The proposals clearly make an effort to produce a building that attempts to reflect and sympathise with the local vernacular by using a timber structure, cladding and a stone/brick plinth, however details such as the double doors at first floor level on the most prominent elevation let the design down.

Application Number: NYM/2020/0346/FL

Elements such as the first floor French doors and the multiple rooflights make the building look overly domestic, reading more like residential/annex accommodation rather than a garage/office space. It is considered that, for the purposes proposed, the size of the overall building is excessive and fails to fully consider the Authority's adopted policies or Design Guides.

Ultimately, the Authority is not against a replacement garage in principle; however the Authority is unable to support a building of such considerable size for the purpose of a garage and home office at the detriment of the main dwelling.

In view of the above, the application is recommended for refusal.

Explanation of how the Authority has Worked Positively with the Applicant/Agent

Negotiations have taken place with the aim of making changes to ensure the proposal complies with the relevant policies of the Development Plan/delivers a sustainable form of development as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, though unfortunately such changes were not implemented/accepted.