

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 May 2017

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 08 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E2734/D/17/3173008

15 Little Studley Road, Ripon, HG4 1HD

- 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 Chris Greenall against the decision of Harrogate Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00308/FUL, dated 7 December 2015, was refused by notice dated 3 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a side and rear two-storey infill extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The application form is dated 7 December 2015, though this would appear to be an identical date to that of an earlier application on the site that was refused by the Council and dismissed on appeal in December 2016. The Decision notice on this current scheme indicates that the application relating to the proposal was received on 23 January 2017. However, I have used the date as written on the application form in the description above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host building.

Reasons

4. No 15 Little Studley Road is a large, white-painted brick built property with a slate roof. It appears to have been extended several times to the north of the original structure, including a two-storey extension, which continues the grain of the original property, and smaller single-storey extensions around and beyond. These extensions appear subservient to the main house and, apart from patio doors to a single-storey front extension, the window style and scale in the northern extensions largely reflect those in the original house. The plot drops down steeply from the road to a parking area and garage, whilst the house occupies a higher position beyond, as the site rises further to the east.
-

5. The proposed extension involves the demolition of most of the existing ground-floor single-storey extensions at the northern end of the property, together with a small first-floor bedroom above. A new two-storey extension would replace these, and would also include infilling to the east and west, creating a single rectangular two-storey extension with a gable to the front and rear. This would have a mono-pitch roof to the front and side, above part of the ground-floor; new windows and patio doors to the front elevation; new windows and doors in the side elevation; new patio doors to the south-facing elevation of the ground floor of the extension; and a balcony outside a new extended master bedroom, accessed through glazed doors in the south-facing elevation.
6. The proposed extension at the northern end of the house has been reduced in size to a very modest degree, but otherwise is similar to that proposed in the earlier refused scheme, although it would appear that there would also now be a reduced amount of glazing in the patio doors and windows in the ground floor. In addition, a second two-storey rear extension, proposed at the southern end of the house, has been omitted altogether.
7. In the earlier appeal decision, the inspector noted that "a gable roof is proposed at the front of the property. Its ridge line would be only marginally lower than that of the main body of the house. Due to the height and width of the gable, together with the floor to ceiling fenestration which would almost extend the width of the gable and wrap around the corner of the property, the northern end of the house would compete with the 'main' element of the dwelling. Consequently, the front elevation of the appeal proposal would not be seen as subservient to the original development". Although some of the floor to ceiling fenestration has been removed from the current scheme, the more significant issues of the scale and design of the northern extension, including a large gable front, have not been dealt with. I concur with the views of the earlier inspector, and I do not consider that the current proposal overcomes the conclusion that the proposal would not be seen as subservient to the original building.
8. As regards the rear of the property, a proposed two-storey extension at the southern end has now been omitted from the current scheme. However, the inspector in the earlier appeal decision noted, amongst other things, that "the rear of the property is characterised by simple lines, relatively few windows to wall area, and plain roof treatments notwithstanding the single storey kitchen which projects to the rear of the house.... The detailing including the use of set in gable features, and the introduction of two new doors, including one at first floor level to serve the balcony would be out of character with the existing unfussy rear elevation". Once again, I concur with these views and, with the exception of the removal of the southern two-storey extension, I do not consider that the significant issue of the rear gable end and the new glazed door elements of the northern extension have been dealt with. The proposed extension would be out of character with the detailing and design of the existing rear elevation.
9. In conclusion, I find that the proposed extension would appear over dominant in the context of the original building and its existing subservient extensions. In addition, its scale and design would fail to reflect and complement the character and appearance of the original dwelling. On this basis, it would not respect the distinctiveness of the host building, and it would be detrimental to its character and appearance.

10. For the above reasons, I find that the proposal would conflict with guidance on design in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), which requires that development should promote or reinforce local distinctiveness, and with Policies HD15 and HD20 of the Harrogate District Local Plan, which reflect the guidance in the NPPF and which require that new development, including extensions, should not result in detriment to the character or appearance of the dwelling. It would also conflict with guidance in the Council's Design Guide on House Extensions and Garages, which sets out principles for the form of an extension.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR