
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2017

by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 29th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E2734/D/17/3170164

Meadow Barn, Winksley to Bridge Banks Farm, Winksley, HG4 3NR

- 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 W Bremner against the decision of Harrogate Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 16/05106/FUL, dated 21 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 3 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is revised application for creation of first floor bedroom with en-suite and rear kitchen extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an attractive barn conversion located in the Nidderdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The building consists of a small two storey element with single storey projections forming an 'L' shape. It has simple rooflines with a single chimney located on the 2 storey element.
4. The development would extend the existing 2 storey element of the building and introduce an additional chimney and front rooflight. The extension would more than double the width of the existing 2 storey element, and would include a stepped roofline. It would be a large dominant addition that would significantly alter the appearance of the property. In particular, the width of the 2 storey extension would unbalance the appearance of the building. Moreover, the proposed chimney and steps in the roof profile would disrupt the simple lines of the building, and the proposed front rooflight would be an unsympathetic feature. For these reasons, the extension would appear incongruous, particularly when viewed from the west, and would not meet the high standard of design expected in the AONB.
5. The appeal property was granted permission for a smaller extension in November 2016 (ref 16/03491/FUL). That development would involve a smaller, simpler, 2 storey extension that would be more sympathetic in scale

and appearance to the host property. Accordingly, I do not consider that this permission lends support to the current appeal proposal.

6. The appellant states that ranges of farm buildings typically incorporate steps-down in roof height. In this regard, my attention has been drawn to a nearby building at Galpay Woods Farm. However, that building is not within the immediate setting of the appeal property and it has a different appearance to it. In this particular case, the proposed extension would be out of character with the host property, for the reasons set out above.
7. It has been put to me that the proposed chimney and front rooflight could be removed by condition. However, that would not overcome my concerns in relation to the size and appearance of the extension.
8. The appeal property is some distance from the road. However, there is a public footpath adjacent to the site and the property is directly visible from this vantage point, and from the fields beyond.
9. Whilst the extension would provide additional living space to the occupiers of the property, including a new en-suite bathroom, that private benefit would not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
10. I conclude that the development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policies SG4 and EQ2 of the Harrogate Core Strategy (2009), Policies C1, C16, H15 and HD20 of the Harrogate Local Plan (2001), and guidance contained in the House Extensions and Garages Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2005). These policies and guidance seek to ensure, amongst other things, that development incorporates high quality locally distinctive design and that extensions do not harm the character or appearance of the host property. The development would also be at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework, which requires good design.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Hatfield

INSPECTOR