



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 September 2017

by Elizabeth Pleasant DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 6 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/E2734/D/17/3179630
8 Westminster Road, Burn Bridge HG3 1LS

- 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 Michael & Rosemary Barker against the decision of Harrogate Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 6.152.44.E.FUL, dated 2 March 2017, was refused by a notice dated 8 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is a two storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey front extension at 8 Westminster Road, Burn Bridge HG3 1LS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 6.152.44.E.FUL, dated 2 March 2017, 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, Scale 1:1250; Block Plan, Scale 1:500; As Existing, M.R.(19)/01; As Proposed, M.R.(19)/02 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing dwelling.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Westminster Road is a residential street characterised by a rich mix of detached properties situated in generous plots. Many of the properties have been altered and extended, however their consistent scale, plot width and use of render as a material of construction, gives the street a distinct character.
4. Despite the original design of the appeal premises mirroring that of the neighbouring dwelling, No 6 Westminster Road, this relationship is not a

- defining characteristic of the street scene as a whole. Furthermore, unlike No 6 the appeal property has a substantial porch addition to its front elevation.
5. The proposed front gable extension would alter the original design of the appeal property. However, the property is not of any special architectural merit and nor does it lie within a conservation area. Moreover, the appearance of the resultant property would not be visually incongruous within the overall context of the street, where many of the properties also have dominant front gables.
 6. I have taken into consideration guidance set out in Section 10 of the Council's House Extensions & Garages Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document, 2005 (SPD), which advises that there will be a general presumption against extensions at the front of a property due to the need to protect the character of existing street scenes. However, it also advises that in a street where there is variety, and particular where there are projecting elements with gables facing the street, a front extension to reflect these may be appropriate.
 7. In this case the design characteristics of dwellings on Westminster Road varies considerably, and many of the properties display front facing gables. The proposed front extension would project no further forward than the existing front porch, and although the properties within the street are generally aligned, the limited projection of the front extension would mean that it would not be unduly prominent, particularly in view of its distance from the highway and the height of the boundary treatment to the front of the house. Furthermore, despite the ridge of the proposed extension aligning with the ridge of the original dwelling, the scale and appearance of the extension would remain subservient in appearance to the original dwelling.
 8. I conclude that the proposed extension would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. I therefore find no conflict with the development plan, and in particular with Policies SG4 and EQ2 of the Harrogate Core Strategy, 2009, Policies H15 and HD20 of the Saved Harrogate Local Plan, 2001 or the SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework, all of which seek to ensure, amongst other things, that new development incorporates high quality locally distinctive design, respects the scale, proportions, height and materials of neighbouring properties, and aim to ensure that extensions are not detrimental to the character and appearance of the dwelling or the surrounding area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that subject to conditions required to provide certainty and safeguard the character and appearance of the area, the appeal should be allowed.

Elizabeth Pleasant

INSPECTOR