
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2017

by Philip Lewis BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E2734/D/17/3167804
419 Skipton Road, Harrogate HG1 3HQ

- 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 Richard Johnson against the decision of Harrogate Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 6.79.13354.FUL, dated 21 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension at 419 Skipton Road, Harrogate HG1 3HQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 6.79.13354.FUL, dated 21 September 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: location plan; S.R.(419)/01 and S.R.(419)/02A.
 - 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.

Procedural matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application in my decision above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue for the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.
-

Reasons

4. The appeal proposal relates to 419 Skipton Road, a two storey detached dwelling with a single storey garage to one side, set back behind the front of the dwelling. It is one of a group of 5 similar houses on the street. No 419 and the neighbouring 421 are symmetrically arranged with the garages opposite each other, each set in off the common boundary, with No 421 set slightly back behind No 419.
5. The appeal scheme involves the addition of a first floor extension above the existing flat roofed garage, with a shallow mono-pitch roof. The garage would be converted to a play room with the garage door being replaced by a window and wall. Given that the ridge of the first floor extension would be below the eaves height of the host dwelling and that the extension would be built above the existing garage and so be set back significantly from the front of the dwelling, it would appear subservient.
6. I saw at my site visit that there are no other first floor extensions above garages in the group of dwellings, although there is a single storey side extension to one dwelling. However, whilst the proposed first floor extension would reduce somewhat the openness between the appeal property and No 421, the gap between the side of the appeal property and the common boundary would be unchanged and no terracing effect would occur. Therefore, I do not consider that there would be unacceptable effect on the space around the buildings.
7. Consequently, given the form, scale, design and subservience of the proposed extension and the fact that it would be set back considerably behind the front of the dwelling with the gap maintained to the common boundary, it would not appear as being disproportionate, excessively bulky or elongated. I also find that whilst the appearance of the dwelling would be altered and the symmetry diminished, this would not give rise to significant harm to the local distinctiveness or character of the area, or be inappropriate or incongruous.
8. The appeal proposal would not therefore give rise to unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area and does not conflict with Harrogate District Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2009 Policies SG4 and EQ2, which amongst other things, are concerned with design and impact of development and the protection of the built environment. It also does not conflict with Harrogate District Local Plan 2001 (Local Plan) saved Policy H15 which is concerned with extensions to dwellings and includes that there should be no detriment to the character or appearance of the dwelling or surrounding area, or with saved Local Plan Policy HD20, which sets out design principles. In addition, the appeal proposal does not conflict with the guidance set out in the Council's House Extensions and Garages Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2005.

Other matters

9. I have had regard to the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework referenced by the Council but they have not led me to a different conclusion. I have also considered that the appeal scheme constitutes minor development in Flood Zone 2 and I am satisfied that the relevant policy tests are met.

Conditions

10. I have imposed conditions regarding timescale and specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty. I have also applied a condition requiring the external building materials to match those of the existing building to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

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

Philip Lewis

INSPECTOR