

# North York Moors National Park Authority

District/Borough: Scarborough Borough Council  
Parish: Fylingdales

Application No. NYM/2016/0696/FL

**Proposal:** Construction of 1 no. dormer to front elevation and 1 no dormer to rear elevation, replacement/enlargement of 1 no. dormer to rear elevation and retention of single storey extension to existing conservatory to rear elevation including installation of flue

**Location:** The Manse, Thorpe Bank, Fylingthorpe

**Decision Date:** 2 January 2017

## Consultations

Parish –

Fylingdales Village Trust -

Site Notice Expiry Date – 16 December 2016

**Others** – Mr John Legg, Grove Cottage, Thorpe Bank, Fylingthorpe – Objects for the following reasons:

- The proposed dormers would greatly erode the privacy to the rear of my property;
- The alterations are not sympathetic to the original features of the property, which is a Victorian manse and will change the appearance of the roof completely;
- The dormers the applicant refers to are all south facing and installed prior to the conservation area coming into being;
- Other application for dormers in Thorpe Bank have been refused and velux roof lights allowed instead (e.g. Burnside and Glenholm);
- The conservatory extension can be seen from the road and it contravenes Article Direction as the materials do not match the existing conservatory - there is also a question whether it complies with fire regulations being a timber construction and involves a fire and flue.

## Director of Planning's Recommendation

Refuse for the following reason:

1.	The proposed dormer windows to the front and rear elevations, by virtue of their form, size, massing, position and poor design detailing, along with the unsympathetic conservatory extension and associated flue would add to the existing visual clutter and cause significant harm to the character and appearance of this attractive and substantial historic property and that of the surrounding conservation area contrary to Core Policy G and Development Policies 3, 4 and 19. It would also conflict with the Authority's adopted Design Guide Part 2: Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings. These policies and guidance aim to ensure that new development achieves a high standard of design, which reflects or complements that of the local vernacular and does not detract from the character, form and setting of the original dwelling.
2.	The proposed dormer windows to the rear elevation will increase the potential for overlooking of the neighbours garden and result in a loss of privacy thereby adversely affecting the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers contrary to Development Policies 3 and 19 of the Core Strategy and Development Policies Document .

*M. Legg*  
21<sup>st</sup> Dec. 2016

---

**Application Number: NYM/2016/0696/FL**

---

**Background**

The Manse is a substantial historic building situated at the heart of Fylingthorpe Conservation Area on one of the principal routes through the settlement. The name 'Manse' suggests an historic association with a local church or chapel and this association would explain the high status of the original building which is evident in the slate roof, finely tooled stonework and imposing façade. The floor plan suggests the potential presence of servants' bedrooms on the top floor which reinforces the high status of the building within the settlement.

The original building is built of coursed sandstone under a slate roof although there is a historic two storey brick lean-to extension to the rear elevation, also under a slate roof. In more recent years a white uPVC conservatory has been added to the rear elevation with the benefit of permitted development rights.

Planning permission is sought for a variety of alterations and extensions to the property comprising a dormer window to both the front and rear elevations of the original building; a wide box dormer the lower roof slope of the brick extension which would replace a small existing dormer; and the retention of a timber clad lean-to extension to the conservatory with a flue.

**Main Issues****Policy Context**

The relevant policies of the Core Strategy and Development Policies Document are Core Policy G (Landscape, Design and Historic Assets) and Development Policies 3 (Design), 4 (conservation Areas) and 19 (Householder Development). In addition Part 2: Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings of the Design Guide is relevant.

Core Policy G seeks to ensure that the landscape, historic assets and cultural heritage of the National Park are conserved and enhanced with particular protection being given to those elements which contribute to the character and setting of conservation areas.

Development Policy 3 seeks to conserve and enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the built environment and the landscape of the Park by requiring a high standard of design detailing, whether traditional or contemporary which reflects or complements that of the local vernacular. The scale, height, massing, proportion, form, size, materials and design features of any proposal should be compatible with the surrounding buildings.

Development Policy 4 seeks to ensure that development within a conservation area preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the area and that the scale, proportions, design and materials respect the existing architectural and historic context with particular reference to traditional buildings, street patterns, the relationship between buildings and spaces and views into and out of the area.

Development Policy 19 is supported of householder development where the scale, height, form, position and design detailing of the proposal does not detract from the character and form of the original dwelling or adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

*MZ*

---

**Application Number: NYM/2016/0696/FL**

---

The Authority's Design Guide is used to add further detail to the policies of the Core Strategy and Development Policies Document and forms part of the Local Development Framework. It therefore is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. It states that poorly designed and unsympathetic modern dormers, which are often large in scale, can harm the character and appearance of the house and the wider area. In particular it advises that the use of dormers on the front elevation will generally be inappropriate unless the local area is characterised by existing dormers on the front elevation and that large flat roof box dormers give a horizontal emphasis and are inappropriate.

**Impact on the host property and Conservation Area**

In both architectural and historic terms the application property contributes significantly towards the character and appearance of the conservation area. Unsympathetic alterations have been carried out in the past, however, which detract from the form and character of the host property and the wider streetscape. These include the replacement of the historic windows and addition of a projecting satellite dish on the front elevation; the construction of two poorly detailed roof lights on the main roof which stand proud of the roof line (one to the front elevation and one to the rear); a poorly detailed and positioned dormer window to the rear elevation which sits at the edge of the historic brick extension, and further low quality extensions to the rear. These alterations might explain why, despite the high status and quality of the original dwelling, it has not been designated as a listed building.

It is acknowledged that a significant number of dormers and roof lights exist within Fylingthorpe but in the vast majority of cases these detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area and serve as an example of the visual harm that can be caused by this type of development. Conversely, as demonstrated by those properties slightly further uphill on the opposite side of Thorpe Bank, an original roof-scape devoid of visual clutter enhances the conservation area.

The proposed dormer windows to the front and rear elevation of the original building would totally undermine the original roof slope by introducing two lower pitch roofs which appear almost as 'wings' in profile. It is considered that any dormer window on original building of The Manse would detract from the original architectural intention of the building and undermine its historic character. Combined with the existing roof lights the dormers would also add further visual clutter to the roofscape. By undermining the architectural and historic character of a principal building at the centre of the settlement, the proposed scheme would also undermine the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Similarly the proposed continuous rear roof slope undermines the architectural character and legibility of the historic building. The separation between the main roof slope and that of the brick extension should be retained, along with guttering to the main roof. The existing flat roof dormer detracts from the character and appearance of the rear elevation, albeit that it is relatively small in scale. The proposed replacement dormer however would be almost four times bigger with an extremely shallow sloping roof and would extend across much of the width of the historic brick extension. Such a large horizontal feature would visually dominate and be out of proportion with the rear façade whilst also concealing the base of the attractive brick chimney stack to the further detriment of the character and appearance of the host property.

Finally it is considered that the proposed lobby extension with the tall flue is very poorly designed and detailed adding visual clutter and sprawling mass of extensions to the rear elevation which pays no respect to the architectural character of the existing building or the

---

**Application Number: NYM/2016/0696/FL**

---

wider conservation area. The flue is visible from Thorpe Lane adding further visual clutter and detracting from views through the conservation area to the wooded valley bottom beyond. This carbuncle should be omitted from the proposed plans.

**Impact on residential amenity**

The proposed dormer to the rear elevation of the original building along with the proposed large box dormer to the lean-to brick extension will increase the potential for overlooking of the neighbours garden. Whilst at present the existing dormer causes some overlooking and loss of privacy, this is limited by the small scale of the dormer and its location at the far end of the brick extension, furthest away from the neighbour's garden. However the proposal for a dormer in the roof of the original building and a large dormer extending almost the full width of the brick extension will increase the opportunities for overlooking and result in a loss of privacy to the neighbours contrary to Development Policies 3 and 19 of the Core Strategy and Development Policies Document.

**Conclusion**

The requirement for development proposals to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area applies with equal force whether or not the proposal is prominent or available to public view. Furthermore a core principle of the NPPF is to always secure development of good design and it advises that permission should be refused for development of poor design which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area.

In light of the above, it is considered that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and that of the surrounding conservation area contrary to Core Policy G and Development Policies 3, 4 and 19. It would also conflict with the Authority's adopted Design Guide Part 2: Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings. These policies and guidance aim to ensure that new development achieves a high standard of design, which reflects or complements that of the local vernacular and does not detract from the character, form and setting of the original dwelling.

Furthermore the proposed dormers to the rear elevation will increase the potential for overlooking of the neighbours garden and result in a loss of privacy thereby adversely affecting the residential amenity of the neighbouring occupiers contrary to Development Policies 3 and 19 of the Core Strategy and Development Policies Document .

**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 meet with the Applicant to discuss the best course of action and is also willing to provide pre-application advice in respect of any future application for a revised development.

MA