
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2016

by Jason Whitfield BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22nd December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/C2708/D/16/3163202

1 Police House, Station Road, Settle BD24 0AB

- 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 and Mrs A Davey against the decision of Craven District Council.
 - The application Ref 31/2016/17029, dated 5 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 24 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension to provide additional bedroom with en-suite over garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two storey side extension to provide additional bedroom with en-suite bedroom over garage, bay window and porch at 1 Police House, Station Road, Settle BD24 0AB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 31/2016/17029, dated 5 June 2016, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The two storey side extension hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The two storey side extension hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 634/1, 634/2, 634/3, 634/4, 634/5 and 634/6.

Procedural Matter

2. The description in the banner heading above is taken from the original application form. However, Section E of the appeal form indicates that a revised description was agreed with the Council to reflect that consent was also sought for a bay window and porch which have already been erected. Nevertheless, retrospective retention, as referred to on the appeal form, does not constitute an act of development. I have, therefore, omitted such reference from the description of development in the formal decision above and dealt with the appeal on the basis that planning permission is being sought for a development which, in respect of the bay window and porch, has already occurred.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is in an area which is predominately residential in character. There is a significant variation in the design and size of neighbouring properties, ranging from detached bungalows to two-storey semi-detached houses, such as the appeal property. Externally the appeal property is finished in a pebble dash render with a tiled roof.
5. I note that no other semi-detached properties along this part of Station Road have two-storey side extensions. Nevertheless, the proposed side extension would be set back from the front elevation of the property at first floor level. Moreover, it would have a lower ridge height, in line with the guidance set out in Appendix F of the Craven District Local Plan 1999 (LP). As a result, the extension would appear as a subservient addition to the original property.
6. The side and rear elevations of the side extension would be finished in render to match the existing property. However, the front elevation of the extension would be finished in natural stone. This would match the bay window and porch which have already been constructed in such materials. The Council contends that the use of natural stone on both the side extension and in the bay window and porch would appear inappropriate and would not respect the host dwelling or the wider area.
7. However, several properties in the area have been constructed in stone, thus the use of such materials would not represent an uncommon feature in the area. Indeed, the proposed materials would not be unduly dissimilar to the adjacent properties of Sandholme Close or the properties opposite on Station Road. Moreover, the contrasting use of stone and render would, in my view, offer an attractive blend in the palette of materials used and would add visual interest to the main elevation of the property. Consequently, I am satisfied that the proposal would not appear out of place or visually unacceptable.
8. Several alterations are proposed to the windows within the property. In particular, the number of windows in the front elevation at first floor level would increase from 2 to 5. Whilst I note that the street scene has a particular rhythm and that the appeal property mirrors the adjoining property, the proposed windows would largely accord with the design and size of the existing windows. Moreover, the windows would be evenly spaced across the front elevation, retaining a sense of balance in the fenestration of the property. Furthermore, views of the extension within the public realm would be limited. There is a dense cover of vegetation to the front of the property and to the side boundary, which limits views into the site from both Station Road and Sandholme Close. As a result, the proposal would not appear as an incongruous or inappropriate form of development.
9. I conclude, therefore, that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would accord with Saved Policy H2 of the LP which states that extensions to existing dwellings will be granted where they do not have an adverse effect on the street scene.

Other Matters

10. The appeal site is located within Flood Zones 2 and 3. Footnote 20 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that all proposals for new development within Flood Zones 2 and 3, including minor development, should provide a Site Specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). As householder

development the proposals would be classed as minor development. However, Paragraph 104 of the Framework states that although minor development is exempt from having to undergo the Sequential Test and subsequent Exception Test, it should still meet the requirement for an FRA.

11. The proposal is accompanied by a completed copy of the Environment Agency's Matrix for Householder Extensions in Flood Zones 2 and 3 which comprises an FRA. The Assessment indicates that floor levels within the development are and would be no lower than existing levels and that flood proofing of the development has and would be incorporated. This demonstrates that flood risk issues have been adequately addressed. I have no reason to disagree with these findings and I am therefore satisfied that the proposal would represent an acceptable form of development having regard to its flood zone location and the provisions of the Framework.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time limit for the proposed side extension, a condition requiring accordance with the approved plans in respect of the side extension is necessary to provide certainty. I have not imposed a condition in respect of matching materials as the proposed materials are depicted on the approved plans. The requirement under Condition 2 to carry out the development in accordance with the approved plans will ensure the proposed materials are used and for the reasons above I consider those materials satisfactory in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Jason Whitfield

INSPECTOR