

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2017

by C L Humphrey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 3rd April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E2734/D/17/3166649

Benny Carr Farm, Pateley Bridge Road, North Yorkshire HG3 3ET

- 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 & Mrs Adam Glassford against the decision of Harrogate Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/04122/FUL, dated 23 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 21 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is extension and conversion of existing outbuildings to form additional living accommodation, including partial demolition and removal of existing timber garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the appeal property.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to Benny Carr Farm, a detached dwelling of stone and slate construction which is set within a large plot in the countryside to the north of the B6165 and west of Burnt Yates.
 4. A series of outbuildings are attached to the west side of the main dwelling and arranged around a courtyard. These outbuildings step down in height from east to west away from the main dwelling, culminating in a single storey stone outbuilding with a lean-to roof which forms the western wing of the courtyard. A timber garage is attached to the west elevation of this outbuilding. It is proposed that the garage would be demolished and the stone outbuilding converted and extended in order to create additional living accommodation.
 5. The appeal proposal would lead to a very modest increase in the footprint of the dwelling and associated attached outbuildings. However, it would result in the addition of a substantial pitched roof over the extended outbuilding. The ridge of this roof would finish higher than that of the adjoining outbuilding. This would disrupt the established architectural hierarchy of the range of buildings and give rise to an overly dominant feature. The prominence of the proposed development would be further exacerbated by the introduction of a large window in the south facing gable.
-

6. Screening provided by hedges and trees, the set-back from the road and the use of matching natural stone and slate materials would not ameliorate the harmful effect of the proposed development.
7. The appeal proposal would not harm the living conditions of neighbours, and I note there were no objections from neighbours or from the Parish Council. However, neither the absence of harm in respect of living conditions nor the lack of objection to the proposals overcomes the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the appeal property.
8. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the appeal property. As such, it would conflict with the design aims of Policies SG4 and EQ2 of the Harrogate District Local Development Framework Core Strategy, Policies H15 and HD20 of the Harrogate District Local Plan, the Harrogate Borough Council House Extensions and Garages Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document and the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C L Humphrey

INSPECTOR