



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 16 April 2021

by **Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 April 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2736/D/21/3266461

The Pheantry, Main Street, Terrington, Malton YO60 6PU

- 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 Ms Jane Kendrick against the decision of Ryedale District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00656/HOUSE, dated 1 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as "proposed single storey extension to the north elevation; upgrade of the storage shed; upgrade of the conservatory".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The proposal includes the upgrade of the storage shed and conservatory. The Council have not raised any objections to these parts of the scheme and they do not form part of the decision notice refusal reasons. I have therefore assessed this appeal only on the proposed single storey extension to the north elevation.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are whether the proposal preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Terrington Conservation Area, the Howardian Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a residential property described as being an amalgamation of a former small cottage, outhouses, former barn and garage with storage. The property is of traditional design, materials and architectural detailing; and sits within the Terrington Conservation Area (TCA) and the Howardian Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (HHAONB).
5. In accordance with the duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 I am required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. Moreover, paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that when considering the impact of new development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
6. The TCA encompasses most of the village of Terrington. The appellant's heritage statement describes the character of the village as being "*modest but*

well-proportioned stone-built pantiled roofed cottages, either single or two storey, arranged in short terrace formations, semi-detached and detached... there is no great imposition of modern infrastructure to disturb the tranquillity of the place and the village has an air of timelessness." I concur with this description of the village and its positive contribution to the TCA.

7. The proposal, due to its design, form and materials, would be an incongruous structure that would not be coherent with the existing property. The proposal would be an unconventional contemporary element however, it would be overly large in scale and the use of timber cladding would be intrusive and detract from the traditional stylings of the existing building in a harmful manner.
8. Whilst the proposal is intended to provide a sound working solution to address the shortcomings of the original layout, the extension would be a complete contrast and not harmonise with the external appearance of the existing property.
9. I have had regard to the appellants statement of case and heritage statement including the development history of the site however, these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified above. The appellant has indicated that the Council's Case Officer had regard to consultee comments in which these consultee Officers had not undertaken site visits. It is also noted that the appellant made efforts to engage in meaningful dialogue with consultees which were ignored. These matters do not alter my findings above.
10. Accordingly, the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the TCA, and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the HHAONB. The proposal would be contrary to Policies SP16 and SP20 of the Ryedale Plan – Local Plan Strategy 2013 and the Framework which seeks development to reinforce local distinctiveness and respect the character and context of the immediate locality.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR