
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 May 2017

by I Jenkins BSc CEng MICE MCIWEM

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

Decision date: 23 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C2708/D/17/3172253

1 Church Street, Gargrave, Skipton, BD23 3NE

- 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 Smales against the decision of Craven District Council.
 - The application Ref 30/2016/17679, dated 21 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is a single stone built attached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single stone built attached garage at 1 Church Street, Gargrave, Skipton, BD23 3NE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. 30/2016/17679, dated 21 December 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: site location plan; and, 263:1 Rev A.
 - 3) Notwithstanding condition no. 2, the materials used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the external surfaces of the existing building.

Main Issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of No. 1 and the Conservation Area within which it is situated as well as the setting of the neighbouring Listed Building.

Reasons

3. No. 1 is a semi-detached dwelling constructed of white painted stonework walls under a stone slate roof. It fronts onto an area of greenspace along the southern bank of a river, a short distance to the east of the southern end of the Gargrave Bridge, which is a grade II Listed Building. The section of Church Street to the south of the bridge is characterised by terraced properties that are also traditional in appearance. The 2 detached dwellings to the southeast of the semi-detached pair that includes No. 1 comprise bungalows of a more modern appearance. All these properties are situated within the Gargrave Conservation Area.
-

4. No. 1 and the adjoining dwelling are irregular in form and markedly different in appearance from each other. The main section of No. 1 comprises a 2-storey pitched roofed building, with a ridge line that runs broadly in an east/west direction. A 2-storey rear annexe with a pitched roof adjoins part of its main back wall. Where they adjoin, the parallel pitched roofs of the rear annexe and the main section of No. 1 form a valley. A single-storey pitched roof annexe projects from the northwestern side wall of the main building. In contrast, the front elevation of the adjoining dwelling is much narrower than that of No. 1, it projects forward beyond the alignment of the main front wall of the appeal property and has a cat-slide roof slope to the front.
5. The proposal involves the erection of a single-storey pitched roof garage, which would adjoin the northwestern side gable wall of the single-storey annexe of the dwelling and would be set back beyond the alignment of its front elevation. It would be possible to ensure that the materials used in the external surfaces of the proposed extension would match those of the existing building, through the imposition of a condition. The proposal would fill the gap between the existing building and the section of access road that runs past the side of the dwelling. However, it is not unusual hereabouts to see buildings positioned close to the highway. I saw that a number of nearby buildings, to the southwest of the site on Church Street, adjoin the edge of the highway footway. Therefore, in my judgement, the proposal would not have an unduly cramped appearance.
6. The northwestern corner of the footprint of the proposed garage would be chamfered, reflecting the curvature of the adjacent road, as a result of which the garage would narrow towards the front. Whilst the proposed extension would be visible from a number of public vantage points, views of it from the neighbouring bridge would be limited by the large trees that occupy part of the space to the northwest of No. 1, between the access road and the bridge. Nevertheless, in any event, the irregular shape of the front section of the proposal would be a small feature of a limited addition to a much larger building, which is itself irregular in character. The design of the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of No. 1, nor would it be likely to harm the character or appearance of the Conservation Area or the setting of the neighbouring bridge.
7. I conclude that the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal property would be acceptable. Furthermore, the development would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would preserve the setting of the neighbouring Listed Building. The proposal would not conflict with Policy H20 of the *Craven District (Outside the Yorkshire Dales National Park) Local Plan*, which seeks to ensure that extensions respect the original property and do not harm the street scene. Nor would it conflict with the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework), the aims of which include promoting high quality design and safeguarding the significance of designated heritage assets.

Conditions

8. The Council has suggested 3 conditions which it considers should be imposed in the event of planning permission being granted. In addition to the normal commencement condition, in the interests of clarity, a condition would be necessary to ensure that the works would be carried out in accordance with the

approved plans, subject to other conditions. In the interests of visual amenity, a condition would also be necessary to ensure that the materials used in the external surfaces of the proposed extension would match those used in the existing building.

9. The proposal would create a space that could be used for car parking and the Highway Authority has suggested that a condition should be imposed to prevent it from being used as living accommodation. In the absence of any evidence to show that existing car parking levels cause problems hereabouts, I consider that such a condition would not be necessary.

Conclusions

10. I conclude that the proposal would amount to sustainable development under the terms of the Framework and it would not conflict with the Development Plan. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

I Jenkins

INSPECTOR