

North York Moors National Park Authority

Delegated decision report

Application reference number: NYM/2021/0634/FL

Development description: alterations, construction of first floor rear and side extensions together with alterations to roof to create balcony

Site address: Susanna Hill, Browside, Ravenscar

Parish: Fylingdales

Case officer: Mrs Jill Bastow

Applicant: Mr D Bowes
Susanna Hill, Browide, Ravenscar, Scarborough, YO13 0NH

Agent: Cheryl Ward Planning, 24 Westfield Mews, Kirkbmoorside, York , YO62 6BA

Director of Planning's Recommendation

Reason(s) for refusal

Refusal reason code	Refusal reason text
1	The proposed alterations and extensions to the dwelling, when taken with the existing and approved extensions, would cumulatively result in a significant increase in the habitable floor space of the original dwelling, extending what was a small cottage significantly beyond its original size. The proposal would result in a combined total of new development which would exceed the specified limit of 30% of new habitable floorspace under Policy CO17 of the NYM Local Plan. The cumulative increase in the overall habitable floorspace would consequently have a detrimental impact on the mix of dwelling types needed to sustain balanced communities within the National Park and result in the loss of a smaller more affordable dwelling.
2	By virtue of their scale, form and design detailing the proposed dormer extension and alterations to the property would not complement the architectural form or character of this modest cottage that makes a positive contribution to the landscape and special qualities of the National Park. The proposed box dormer would dominate the rear elevation giving the appearance of a zinc clad, flat roof first floor extension and as such would not be subservient to the original dwelling thereby harming its character and appearance and setting in the landscape. The proposal is therefore contrary to Strategic Policy C and Policy CO17 of the NYM Local Plan, the Authority's Design Guide Part 2: Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings and the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular paragraph 134 which advises that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and supplementary planning documents such as design guides.
3	It is considered that due to scale, height, form and position of the proposed side extension and rear dormer extension, and the close proximity of the neighbouring property, the proposals would have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of the occupiers contrary to Strategic Policy C and Policy CO17 of the NYM Local Plan.

Consultation responses

Parish

No objection

Natural England

No comments received

National Trust

No comments received

Third party responses

No comments received.

Publicity expiry

Site notice expiry date: 28 September 2021



Photo showing side and rear elevation where the zinc clad box dormer is proposed



Photo showing front elevation with the existing raking dormers and lean-to extension

Background

Susanna Hill Cottage is a modest detached property occupying a remote, cliff edge position accessed from the single track road from Ravenscar to Stoup Brow. The property forms part of a small cluster of properties set below road level and is not readily visible from the track. It is constructed of stone under a pantile roof with the front and side elevations covered in white painted smooth render. The front and side single storey extension have slate roofs and the cottage is fitted throughout with dark grey powder coated aluminium window frames.

Planning permission was granted in March 2019 for several small scale additions to the property: a flat roof dormer to the rear elevation to facilitate the creation of an en-suite WC at first floor; the roofing over of the rear walkway to create an entrance hall, WC and en-suite to the ground floor bedroom; and a lean-to kitchen extension to the front elevation in dark grey painted timber boarding under a dark grey felted roof. The roofing over the rear walkway to create an entrance hall has been completed and as such the planning permission remains valid for the dormer to the rear elevation and the kitchen extension.

Planning permission is now sought for further alterations and extension to the property comprising an extension to the ground floor study/bedroom and the construction of a first floor over it to provide a further bedroom; a dormer to the rear elevation to provide an en-suite bathroom to the master bedroom and a second staircase to provide access to the proposed first floor bedroom; alterations to the front dormers from a cat-slide roof with glazed cheeks to a flat roof with zinc cladding; and change from a lean-to roof to a flat roof with roof terrace to the existing single storey front extension.

Main issues

Local Plan Policy

Strategic Policy C (Quality and Design of Development) seeks to maintain and enhance the distinctive character of the National Park with a set of detailed criteria to be complied with. It requires proposals to be of a high quality design that will make a positive contribution to the local environment and to 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. In the justification to that policy it advises that more contemporary, modern designs will be supported where they are sympathetic to their surroundings, reinforce local distinctiveness and add variety to the National Park's built heritage.

Policy CO17 (Householder Development) requires the scale, height, form, position and design of any extension to not detract from the character and form of the original dwelling or its setting in the landscape and to reflect the principles outlined in the Authority's Design Guide. In addition it requires that any extension should be clearly subservient to the host dwelling and should not increase the total habitable floorspace by more than 30% unless there are compelling planning considerations in favour of a larger extension. It also requires the design and detailing to complement the architectural form and character of the original dwelling and any new roofline to respect the form and symmetry of the original dwelling.

The NNPF at paragraph 130 advises that planning policies and decisions should ensure that developments will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development; are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping; and are sympathetic to local character and history,

including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change. At paragraph 134 it states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and supplementary planning documents such as design guides.

Principle

The proposals would incrementally extend what is a small 2-3 bedroom cottage significantly beyond its original size to create a 3-4 double bedroom property which would have a detrimental impact on the character of the area and result in the loss of a smaller more affordable dwelling.

In line with Policy CO17 and the Householder Extensions Planning Advice Note the existing habitable floorspace of the main domestic dwelling has been calculated based on the extent of the main domestic dwelling as it was on 1 July 1948 excluding any extensions erected after then. As such the internal habitable floorspace of the original dwelling extends to approx. 94.2 sq.m. However it has previously been extended to both sides to provide a dining room (NYM/2008/0641/FL) and a study/3rd bedroom (NYM/2007/1048/FL) along with a rear entrance porch (NYM/2019/0040/FL). These extensions provide a total additional habitable floorspace of approx. 28.6 sq.m which represents a 30% increase. The current proposals to enlarge the ground floor study/bedroom and provide a first floor bedroom above along with the rear dormer would provide an additional 26.6 sq.m. Furthermore there is an extant planning permission for a kitchen extension to the front elevation which would provide a further 4.6 sq.m. When these proposed and permitted extensions are taken into consideration with the existing extensions, they would amount to a 63.4% increase in the floorspace, well in excess of the 30% stipulated by Policy CO17.

It is appreciated that the existing internal layout does not lend itself to family living with 2 first floor bedrooms and one small ground floor en-suite study/bedroom and that the proposals would provide an en-suite master bedroom along with 3 further double bedrooms. However unfortunately these are not considered to be compelling planning considerations that weigh in favour of such a significant increase in floorspace that would result in the loss of a smaller, more affordable dwelling within the National Park and as such the proposal is contrary to Policy CO17.

Design

Policy CO17 requires any extension to be clearly subservient to the host dwelling and requires the design and detailing to complement the architectural form and character of the original dwelling with any new roofline respecting the form and symmetry of the original dwelling. In the justification to the policy it also advises that extensions to traditional buildings in particular should respect and sustain the historical significance, character and appearance of the original building through sensitive design. Furthermore the Design Guide Part 2: Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings identifies that poorly designed and unsympathetic modern dormers, often large in scale, can harm the character and appearance of buildings and their setting.

The proposed enlargement of the ground floor study/bedroom and the construction of a first floor above this would be subservient to the original dwelling being set back from the front elevation with a lower ridge height. It is considered that the scale, height, form and design of this extension would not detract from the character and form of the original dwelling or its setting in the landscape and that it reflects the principles outlined in the Authority's Design Guide.

Unfortunately the same cannot be attributed to the proposed dormer alterations and extensions. Small gabled or raking dormer windows are a traditional feature in some parts of the National Park, and the existing cat-slide dormers to front elevation with their glazed cheeks are modest in size and scale and entirely in keeping with the character and appearance of the original dwelling. Furthermore the lean-to extension to the front elevation (dating from before 1948) is also traditional in form. The proposal to remodel front dormers so that they are flat roof structures with zinc cladding and to make the existing lean-to extension a flat roof with a roof terrace would detract from the original character and appearance of this modest cottage and its setting in the landscape. The Authority does not object in principle to extensions of a modern contemporary design but not when such proposal would fail to complement and enhance the architectural form of the host property.

With regard to the proposed box dormer extension to the rear roof slope, Officers have previously advised the applicant at pre-application stage that the Authority would be unlikely to support a large box dormer extension as it would fail to complement the form or character of the host property. This proposal is for a substantial dormer which would extend across at least 70% rear roof of original cottage and continue across part of the rear roof of proposed side extension creating an awkward arrangement. It would obscure much of the pantiled roof of the original dwelling and would completely alter the form and shape of the roof structure with the appearance of a zinc clad first floor flat roof extension to the detriment of the character and appearance of the building. The scheme therefore fails to meet the Authority's Design Guide which advises that dormers should be considerably smaller in scale than the main roof and should not dominate the elevation. It goes on to advise that large flat roof box dormers are inappropriate.

In view of the above the proposals are contrary to the policies of the Local Plan, the Authority's Design Guide and the design policies of the NPPF, and in line with paragraph 134 of the NPPF should be refused.

Residential Amenity

Policy CO17 also requires that proposals should not adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers. It is noted that no objections have been received from the occupiers of neighbouring property however Officers are of the opinion that the first floor bedroom extension over the enlarged ground floor study/bedroom would have a detrimental impact on the amenity enjoyed by those residents. Owing to the ground levels about this cluster of properties the proposed first floor extension would be set at a lower level such that in effect it would appear to the neighbouring property as a single storey, ground floor extension rather than a two storey extension. Nonetheless the distance from the windows to the front elevation of the neighbouring property to the bedroom extension would only be 5.8 metres and being located to the east would result in a loss of morning sun, overshadowing and have an overbearing impact. Furthermore the rear box dormer at a height of 2.3 metres along the common boundary and only 3 metres from the windows to the neighbouring property would also have an overbearing impact, whereas at present the window face a roof that slopes away. As such it is considered that due to the close proximity, position and height of the proposed side and rear extensions they would have an adverse impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Explanation of how the Authority has worked positively with the applicant/agent

The Local Planning Authority has acted positively and proactively in determining this application by identifying matters of concern with the proposal and determining the application within a timely

manner, clearly setting out the reason(s) for refusal, allowing the Applicant the opportunity to consider the harm caused and whether or not it can be remedied by a revision to the proposal. The Local Planning Authority is willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.