
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 May 2020

by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20th May 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E2734/D/20/3246128

Wayside House Farm, Back Road, High Birstwith, Harrogate HG3 2LU

- 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 B Cooper against the decision of Harrogate Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: 19/04373/FUL, dated 14 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. During the course of the appeal, the Council adopted the Harrogate District Local Plan 2014 – 2035 (2020) (LP). The policies contained in the LP replace those in the former Core Strategy (2009) and Local Plan (2001) that are referred to in the Council's reason for refusal. In the interests of fairness, the main parties were given the opportunity to comment on this matter. Accordingly, I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and on the Nidderdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises a well-proportioned two storey replacement dwelling. It is constructed of stone with a slate roof, has a linear form and is traditional in its design. The elevation facing the road is pleasingly simple and contains a limited amount of openings. The building's overall appearance is akin to that of the scattered farmhouses and cottages found in the area.
5. The appeal site lies in an elevated and prominent position within the AONB and alongside the road. The character within the vicinity of the site is one of a generally undulating plateau landscape with open and extensive views. With the appeal property's existing form and appearance, it fits comfortably into these surroundings, despite of its sensitive location.
6. The proposal would result in an extension to the front elevation that would face the road. As it would project out, its siting would detract from the simple composition of this elevation and the linear arrangement of the property. In

- addition, the amount of glazing would not be in keeping with the more traditional design of the property with its sparser arrangement of windows.
7. As a result, the overall form and appearance of the proposal would be in marked contrast to the host building. This would draw unfavourable attention to it, even with its subservient scale. The property would no longer have a satisfying simple appearance, but would be more complex and so detract appreciably from its character.
 8. In relation to the effects on the AONB, these would be pronounced closest to the site because the incongruous form and appearance of the proposal would be most evident as the property is approached along the road. The somewhat exposed position and the open landscape character would also result in the visual harm extending more broadly into the local area. That the proposal was designed to allow views into Nidderdale only further demonstrates that such concerns would be likely to be realised. As a consequence, it would not conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the AONB.
 9. The appellant has referred me to the original dwelling on the site. The associated stone porch structure was considerably more in keeping than the proposal that is for my consideration. I have not been provided with details of other 'lean-to' structures elsewhere in the AONB. Nevertheless, the proposal would give rise to the concerns that I have identified. The same applies as regards extensions to a nearby property that I have been referred to, especially when the particular location of the appeal property is considered. Hence, these matters do not alter my conclusion.
 10. As regards the rationale for the proposal and the benefits which have been put forward, these are largely of a personal nature and would not outweigh the harm that would arise.
 11. I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the building and on the AONB. As such, it would not comply with Policies HP3, HS8, GS6 and NE4 of the LP which, collectively, concern high quality locally distinctive design; the protection of character and appearance, including landscape character; and afford strong protection to the natural beauty and special qualities of the AONB.
 12. The proposal would also not comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) where it states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty of AONBs which, amongst other designations, have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.
 13. It would also not accord with the Council's House Extensions & Garages Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2005) which seeks to ensure that an extension is sympathetic to the existing house and in keeping with the local character. Whilst the appellant considers the Council has placed too much weight on this document, its approach in promoting higher design standards is not unreasonable. In any event, the appellant's position in this regard would not address that the proposal would be in conflict with the LP and the Framework.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all matters that have been raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

Darren Hendley

INSPECTOR