The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2016

by Y Wright BSc (Hons) DipTP DMS MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/E2734/D/16/3160860
Dairy House, Nidd Lane, Birstwith, Harrogate HG3 3AW

- 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 Geoff Packer against the decision of Harrogate Borough Council.
- The application Ref 16/03594/FUL, dated 22 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 October 2016.
- The development proposed is described as 'erection of porch – revised scheme'.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Whilst a postcode is not included on the planning application form, for reasons of clarity I include it in the banner heading above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the building.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a stone built agricultural building which has previously been converted for residential use. It forms part of a group of converted buildings which are located to the north and west. There are open fields to the east and south. The proposal would add a porch to the eastern elevation of the existing property.

5. Policy H15 of the Harrogate District Local Plan (2001) (LP) seeks, amongst other things, residential extensions that do not result in detriment to the character or appearance of the dwelling. LP Policy HD20 seeks high standards of design in accordance with a list of design principles. Policy SG4 of the Harrogate District Core Strategy (2009) (CS) includes seeking development that is appropriate to the form and character of the settlement and/or landscape character and protects visual amenity. CS Policy EQ2 seeks to protect and enhance the local built and natural environment. The Council's House Extensions and Garages Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2005) (SPD) sets out design principles and seeks extensions that are sympathetic to the existing house and in keeping with the local character.

6. In considering this appeal I am also mindful that the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) also places great importance on development being of good design and responding to local character to ensure the integration of new development into the existing environment.

7. I saw on my site visit that the southern and eastern elevations of the property are clearly visible from the adjacent lane, public footpath and open countryside.

8. Whilst the porch would be modest in size and the construction materials would match the existing property, its location on the eastern elevation of the property would result in a visually prominent addition, clearly visible from the adjacent public footpath and lane. This prominence would be particularly exacerbated by the break-up of the existing roofline. Overall the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the main structure and would not be sympathetic to its existing simple and linear design.

9. In reaching my decision I have taken into account the Appellant's desire to provide an area for wet shoes and coats and to limit the wind blowing into the kitchen. I have also considered the Appellant's comments that the design of the porch is common in many barns locally. However on this latter point no substantive evidence is before me to demonstrate that this is the case. Overall these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified.

10. Consequently, taking the above into account, I conclude that the development as proposed would result in an extension that would be visually prominent and form an incongruous and intrusive feature, which would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the property. It would therefore not accord with the Framework and would be contrary to LP Policies H15 and HD20; CS Policies SG4 and EQ2 and the SPD.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Y. Wright

INSPECTOR