



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2019 by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E2734/D/19/3238240

2 Arthurs Avenue, Harrogate, HG2 0DX

- 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 and Dr Milner against the decision of Harrogate Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02341/FUL, dated 9 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as first floor side extension over existing attached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host building and area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is adjacent to a busy traffic-controlled crossroad junction, consequently the site is visible from Arthurs Avenue, Otley Road and Cold Bath Road. To the east is Harrogate Grammar School and to the north is a public house. The boundary of the Harrogate Conservation Area (the CA) lies on the opposite side of Otley Road to the north and further to the east, beyond the Grammar School. However, there is a distinct change in character between the modest semi-detached dwellings on Arthurs Avenue, which appear to date from the early twentieth century, and the properties within the CA which consist of a mix of terraced properties of vernacular design and materials, and imposing Victorian/ Edwardian town houses.
5. Properties along this section of Otley Road are set back from the highway which provides a sense of openness and spaciousness. No.2's current extensions project beyond the building line. Similarly, No.63 Otley Road has a garage which sits forward of the building line; the garage is not prominent

- within the street scene as it is single storey and the boundary hedge largely screens the building.
6. No.2 is a two-storey semi-detached residential property. The dwelling has been extended; it has a two-storey and single-storey garage extension to the side. The existing two-storey side extension is not set back from the front elevation and therefore no.2 is visibly wider than the adjoining property which has not been extended to the side. The scheme has been revised and attempts have been made to reduce the proposal's visual effect through the roof design and set back.
 7. It is proposed to extend the property at first floor above the existing garage and to the side of the existing two-storey extension. The use of matching materials and windows would assist in integrating the extension with the existing property. However, the proposed first-floor extension would be more prominent than the existing garage because of its increased height. Due to the previous two-storey side extension, the development would result in an elongated property which would not reflect its original character as one of a matching pair of semi-detached properties. Whilst some of that symmetry has been eroded by the previous extension, the current proposal would result in a far more elongated and prominent addition which would be inconsistent with the simple architectural style of the original dwelling because of its bulk and massing.
 8. Currently only the roof of the garage is visible from the street scene due to the boundary hedge and solid entrance gates. As a result of the proposed extension's height, it would have a greater visual impact than the existing garage. The extension would be evidently close to the boundary. The gap to the side boundary is a key characteristic of this side of Otley Road. Whilst the hedge would screen the existing ground floor it would not screen the proposed extension, thus the scheme would be significantly more noticeable than the existing garage. Accordingly, the development would be prominent within the street scene and would erode the presently open character which is a positive aspect of the properties on this side of Otley Road. Due to its siting, scale and massing the extension would be visually harmful to the spatial quality of the street scene.
 9. For these reasons, I find that the proposed development would be visually harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. Consequently, the scheme would conflict with Policies SG4 and EQ2 of the Harrogate District Local Development Framework: Core Strategy (2009), along with saved Policies H15 and HD20 of the Harrogate District Local Plan (2007), guidance contained within the House Extensions and Garages Design Guide (2005) and the National Planning Policy Framework. These Policies seeks, amongst other matters, to promote good design and to ensure new development does not harm the character and appearance of areas.

Other Matters

10. As noted above, the appeal site is located adjacent to the CA. The Council has not raised concern that the proposal would harm the CA and I have no reason to disagree. The harm that I have identified relates to the character of the dwelling itself, which is not within the CA and on the open quality of the run of properties on the south side of Otley Road which also sit outside the CA. As set out above, the character of those properties is quite different to the character

of properties within the CA. In other words, the qualities that will be harmed are not integral to the character of the CA and I am satisfied that the development will have a neutral impact upon how the CA is experienced and the development will not cause harm to the clearly defined character or appearance of the designated heritage asset.

11. I acknowledge that the proposal would not cause harm to the living conditions of existing occupants and there have been no objections to the scheme.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

L M Wilson

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I agree and conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR