



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2019

by C L Humphrey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/E2734/D/19/3235278

Lobley Cottage, Ilton Bank, Ilton HG4 4JY

- 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 Mrs Edward Lambert against the decision of Harrogate Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01289/FUL, dated 25 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is 'erection of a single storey side extension and erection of a two storey rear extension.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appeal site is located in the Nidderdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). In determining this appeal, I have had regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB in accordance with Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 (as amended).

Main Issue

3. The effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Lobley Cottage is a handsome stone built 2-storey dwelling with distinctive gable chimneys and water tabling. Based on the evidence before me, the house previously had an attached single storey lean-to on the west elevation, together with a series of outbuildings to the rear. These outbuildings have since been linked to the main house by a single storey extension which was granted planning permission in 2000. Additionally, in 2012, planning permission was granted for a 'two storey extension and conversion of garage to form additional accommodation' to the west elevation; this has since been implemented.
5. The modest single storey link extension would be demolished and replaced with a 2-storey addition on a far larger footprint. This would have a substantial depth and would extend across much of the rear elevation of the main house, projecting considerably beyond the first floor side elevation of the original dwelling and terminating just behind the west elevation of the existing first floor side extension. The eaves would be the same height as the main house, and there would be little discernible difference in the ridge height.

6. Consequently, by virtue of its width, depth and height, the extension would dominate the rear and side elevations of the property. It would be particularly conspicuous when viewed from Ilton Bank to the north and east and would appear as an oppressive and overbearing feature which would detract from the finely balanced proportions and composition of the main house.
7. The proposed single storey side extension to the west elevation would extend considerably beyond the line of the former lean-to. Only slightly smaller in footprint than the main house, and finishing broadly level with the first floor window cills, it would appear excessively dominant and would be visible from the road to the south and the approach from the north up Ilton Bank.
8. The appellant states the proposal would 'represent a 63% increase in the ground floor of the original built form of Lobley Cottage', and points to the supporting text to saved Policy H15 of the Harrogate District Local Plan (LP) and the Harrogate Borough Council House Extensions and Garages Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which set out that proposals to extend the original ground floor area of a house by more than 50% will not normally be permitted unless there is an exceptional household need.
9. I note the requirement to provide an additional bedroom to accommodate the appellants' family, a dining room to allow them to eat together and office accommodation to serve the appellant's businesses, thereby reducing the need to travel. The modest economic and social benefits of the proposal with regard to the vitality and viability of the local rural community are also acknowledged. However, I have no evidence that these outcomes could not be achieved through other, more sympathetic, means.
10. Nor do I have any evidence that the scale of the proposed 2-storey extension is dictated by internal levels, the position of the staircase or head height, or that the appeal property is likely to become a holiday cottage if the appeal were to fail. I note the appellant's statement that the scheme has the support of the Parish Council and local community, however I must determine the appeal with regard to the planning merits of the case.
11. The appellant refers to extensions to the nearby Rose Cottage, which were recently granted planning permission. Whilst I do not have full details of this other scheme, it appears from the evidence before me that it related to two single storey rear extensions. As such, it does not seem to be directly comparable to the appeal proposal. Reference is also made in the appellant's appeal statement to extensions to The Firs, although I have only been provided with limited details and so cannot draw comparisons with the appeal property or scheme. In any event, each case must be considered on its own merits.
12. Based on the plans and details before me, the proposed materials and fenestration would be sympathetic to the host property, and precise details could be secured by condition were the scheme acceptable in all other regards.
13. Overall however, for the foregoing reasons, the proposed development would be detrimental to a vernacular building of considerable merit. Consequently, I conclude that it would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area and would neither conserve nor enhance the natural beauty of the AONB. It would therefore be contrary to Harrogate District Core Strategy Policies EQ2 and SG4, saved LP Policies C1, H15 and HD20, the SPD and the

National Planning Policy Framework which collectively seek to secure good design and to conserve and enhance the natural and built environment.

Other Matters

14. I note the appellant's efforts to address the Council's concerns regarding an earlier version of the scheme, which was also refused planning permission. However, I must determine the appeal on its own merits, and have done so.
15. Whilst the appellant asserts that there was an 'active evasion of communication from the Council' during the application process, I have no evidence of this. In any event, this matter does not materially affect my consideration of the planning merits of the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons set out above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

CL Humphrey

INSPECTOR