The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2020

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/E2734/D/20/3250001
Orchard Corner, Arkendale Road, Staveley HG5 9JX

- 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 David Allon against the decision of Harrogate Borough Council.
- The application Ref 19/04806/FUL, dated 16 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 March 2020.
- The development proposed is retrospective application for the erection of automated gates and gateposts.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. At my site visit I saw that the development had commenced and appeared to be substantially complete, although the colour of the gateposts differed from that stated on the submitted plans. I have determined this appeal on the basis of the submitted details, whilst also having regard to the development as built.

3. The description of the development provided on the planning application form has been replaced by a fuller version on the decision notice and in subsequent appeal documents. I consider that subsequent description accurately reflects the proposal and I have therefore used it within this decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The proposal consists of two automated gates of a solid construction suspended from two pillars. The frontage of properties in this extent of the streetscape is characterised by high hedges and open vehicular access points. Within this context the proposal would appear as a stark and obtrusive feature which would not reflect the prevailing character of the streetscape. This harm would be exacerbated due to the prominent location of the site at one of the main entrances into the village.

6. The use of white render for the gateposts would add to this obtrusive appearance as this would not reflect the boundary treatments in the vicinity of

the site. The materials used for the dwelling do not set a visual context for the proposal due to its relatively secluded position set further back in the site. The appellant contends that the gates are coloured to reflect the road surfacing, although I saw that this darker treatment adds to the obtrusive and solid character of the gates, as well as that of the gateposts as built. The lighting details would also appear as contrived features which add to the incongruous appearance of the proposal.

7. The appellant has referred to a number of high gates of a solid construction elsewhere within the village. However, I saw that these were limited in number and reflected historic development in the village, including the use of appropriate materials. Furthermore, they are within the historic core of the village some distance from the appeal site, and do not set a context for the proposal. Even within the relatively modern character of development in this area of the village, the proposal would appear as an incongruous feature due to its inappropriate use of materials, height and sense of enclosure.

8. I conclude that the proposal would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the area due to its design and location. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy HP3 of the Harrogate District Local Plan 2020 with regards to high quality design and local distinctiveness. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework with regards to achieving well designed places. The proposal would conflict with the advice of the Council's House Extensions and Garages Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2005 which seeks to maintain or enhance local distinctiveness.

Other Matter

9. The Council Officer's report and comments from the Parish Council refer to the effect of the proposal on parking, access and highway safety. However, this is not referred to in the Council's reason for refusal. Had I been minded to allow this appeal this is a matter I would have considered further.

Conclusion

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

David Cross

INSPECTOR