

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2016

by Beverley Wilders BA (Hons) PgDurp MRTPI

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

Decision date: 8 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/E2734/W/16/3155465

Minskip Road, Boroughbridge, North Yorkshire YO51 9HY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr David Walker against the decision of Harrogate Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 15/05563/OUT, dated 16 December 2015, was refused by notice dated 15 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as outline application for the erection of one dwelling (with all matters reserved) at land comprising part of OS field 9939, Minskip Road, Boroughbridge.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The proposal is for outline planning permission with all matters reserved. A Proposed Site Plan was submitted with the application showing an indicative position and scale of footprint for the proposed two storey dwelling and I have had regard to this in reaching my decision.
3. The site location is described in the description of development on the application form as comprising part of OS field 9939. However it is described as OS field 1538 on the Council's decision notice and the appeal form. Irrespective of the appropriate OS field reference I am satisfied that the site location is clear from the submitted plans and I have dealt with the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a rectangular shaped piece of land positioned adjacent to Minskip Road in an open countryside location. It contains an existing single storey storage building at the rear, an access track off the road and a parking area with the remainder of the site being undeveloped. The site is bounded by hedgerows.
-

6. The immediate surrounding area is rural in character with similar shaped and sized plots to either side of the appeal site also containing utilitarian buildings at the rear. There are open fields on the opposite side of Minskip Road and to the south of the site beyond the adjacent plot. To the north of the site there is a small ribbon of residential development with dwellings located to the front of plots and set back slightly from the road. However the appeal site is physically and visually separated from this ribbon of development by an intervening plot containing a farm shop at the rear of the site set back from the road.
7. At the time of my visit there was evidence of development taking place to the rear of the farm shop and to the rear of dwellings at the opposite end of the ribbon of dwellings. I understand that the development to the rear of the farm shop involves the construction of chalets on a former lorry yard though I have not been provided with the specific details relating to the case.
8. The proposal to erect a dwelling on the appeal site would extend residential development beyond the existing ribbon of residential development adjacent to Minskip Road into an area which is more rural in character and appearance. In my view this would be harmful to and out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area. In reaching my decision I have had regard to the Character Appraisal (CA) submitted with the appeal and to the fact that the appeal site is located in a settlement character area within the North Yorkshire County Council Historic Landscape Characterisation Project/Assessment (2011). However despite the fact that the dwelling plot size and layout would be similar to other dwellings in the nearby ribbon, for the reasons stated above I do not agree with the conclusions of the CA or that the location of the appeal site within a settlement character area means that residential development within that area is necessarily acceptable.
9. Though I note reference to the chalet site and to two other sites nearby which have been the subject of applications for residential development and though I have been provided with some limited details regarding the chalet site, I am not aware of the details or particular circumstances relating to these cases. From what I understand the chalet site appears to involve the re-development of a brownfield site and it is not therefore directly comparable to the proposal. As such I give it limited weight and in any event I must determine the proposal before me on its own merits.
10. Taking the above matters into consideration, I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. It is therefore contrary to Policy C2 of the Harrogate District Local Plan and to Policy SG4 of the Harrogate Core Strategy. These policies seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development proposals protect existing landscape character.

Other Matters

11. There appears to be some disagreement between the main parties as to whether the Council currently has a five year housing land supply. However irrespective of this, in terms of paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework, policies C2 and SG4 are not relevant policies for the supply of housing, they deal with more detailed matters including the potential impacts of development. In any event I consider that the economic and social benefits of providing one dwelling is significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the harm that would result to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

12. For the above reason and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Beverley Wilders

INSPECTOR