
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2016

by Helen Cassini BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 07 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/E2734/D/16/3156804
117 Prince Rupert Drive, Tockwith YO26 7PT

- 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 Simon Blake against the decision of Harrogate Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/02194/FUL, dated 28 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is the bricking up and in-filling of undercover porch area at front of house to increase the size of the downstairs WC/cloakroom. Front door will then move to the side elevation and a new window installed to the side of the front door (for the downstairs WC/cloakroom).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the bricking up and in-filling of undercover porch area at front of house to increase the size of the downstairs WC/cloakroom. Front door will then move to the side elevation and a new window installed to the side of the front door (for the downstairs WC/cloakroom) at 117 Prince Rupert Drive, Tockwith, YO26 7PT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/02194/FUL, dated 28 May 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Plan, Block Plan, 117 Prince Rupert Drive, Tockwith – Amended Existing Layout, 117 Prince Rupert Drive, Tockwith – Amended Proposed Layout.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The host dwelling is a detached two storey dwelling located within a cul-de-sac. The area is residential in character with a mix of architectural styles, although
-

it is dominated by two storey detached dwellings and bungalows, all of which appear to be set in relatively generous plots.

4. The cul-de-sac consists of both two storey dwellings and bungalows. Nos 115, 119 and 121 Prince Rupert Drive are of the same design, with No 119 having converted their garage into an additional room. The front elevations of Nos 115-119 are broadly in line with each other, with No 121 being slightly set back, although this is not unduly prominent given the corner location and enclosure by significant hedges. Detached bungalows are located on the opposite side of Prince Rupert Drive to the host dwelling and are all broadly consistent in terms of design, although one has been extended at the front.
5. The host dwelling currently has an existing porch with a flat roof and a corner pillar, which provides a recessed area over the front door. The proposal is modest in scale, measuring approximately 1.4 metres by 2 metres and would infill the recess.
6. I note that the Harrogate Borough Council – Houses Extensions & Garages Design Guide: A companion to the Residential Design Guide 2005 (the SPG) states that there will be a general presumption against extensions at the front of a property due to the need to protect the character of existing street scenes, as such extensions can appear unduly prominent and incongruous.
7. Nevertheless I consider that the proposal would be viewed as a subservient addition, which would not upset the balanced appearance of the host dwelling. Moreover, given the modest scale it would not represent an intrusive or alien feature within the wider street scene.
8. I have also had regard to the fact that the recesses on the neighbouring dwellings have not been in-filled and also the general absence of similar additions within the wider locality. However, my overall findings in respect of the main issue are that the proposal would not cause harm to the architectural integrity of the host dwelling, the street scene or the wider character and appearance of the area.
9. It would therefore accord with Policies HD20 and H15 of the Harrogate District Local Plan 2001, Policy SG4 of the Harrogate District Local Development Framework: Core Strategy 2009 and the SPG, which when taken together, amongst other things, seek to ensure that new development does not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of host dwellings or the wider area.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council and find them all to be reasonable and necessary in the circumstances of this case.
11. In addition to the standard commencement condition, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans in order to provide certainty. In order to ensure a high quality development, a condition relating to the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the proposal is also necessary.

Conclusion

12. I therefore conclude that, subject to appropriate conditions, the appeal should be allowed.

Helen Cassini
INSPECTOR