



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/20/3251293

22 Appleby Crescent, Knaresborough HG5 9LS

- 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 Paul Cheffings against the decision of Harrogate Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00372/FUL, dated 28 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of extension to existing garage including raised ridge height.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal proposal relates to a detached garage to the front of the host property. The existing garage is of a modest scale and complements the detached house due to its clearly subservient appearance. It is proposed to extend the garage to the side and replace the 'pyramid' style roof with a gable roof of an increased ridge height.
4. Due to the increased height and massing of the gable roof, the extended garage would appear as an overly large free-standing building located to the front of the dwelling. When combined with the increased bulk of the building, the raised eaves height as well as the extent of wall above the doors on one elevation would give the building an ungainly top heavy appearance. The proposal would therefore result in an overdominant addition which would not sit comfortably in relation to the house.
5. The appeal site is prominent within the streetscape due to the curve of the highway. The loss of part of the hedge along the site boundary would increase that prominence and would add to the incongruous appearance of the building within the streetscape.
6. There is a garage with a gable roof on the opposite side of the road which would appear to be of a broadly similar height as the appeal proposal and

which also projects close to the highway. However, this is an attached garage viewed within the immediate context of the gable wall of the host building. This is materially different to the appeal proposal and does not establish a wider context for free-standing buildings of the scale of that proposed. Furthermore, the proposal would also be of a different design in respect of the height of the eaves. Even within the varied context of the wider streetscape, the proposal would appear as an unduly large and incongruous feature located to the front of the dwelling.

7. I have had regard to the benefits of the proposal, including the provision of office space for an emerging business. However, these benefits would not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
8. I conclude that the proposal would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies HP3 and HS8 of the Harrogate District Local Plan 2020 with regards to high quality design as well as the adverse impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the surrounding area. The proposal would also be contrary to the House Extensions & Garages Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2005 in respect of the design of outbuildings and garages.
9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR