



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 20 July 2021

by F Wilkinson BSc (Hons), MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E2734/D/21/3272299

White Horse Barn, Arkendale Road, Staveley HG5 9JU

- 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 Mandy Umpleby against the decision of Harrogate Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/04737/FUL, dated 24 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a single storey extension to existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Following the submission of the appeal a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published. I have sought the views of the main parties as to the relevance of any changes. I have taken account of the revised Framework in my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and area.

Reasons

4. White Horse Barn is a two storey dwelling formed from a converted agricultural building and lies in the open countryside just to the south east of the village of Staveley. There are two dwellings adjacent to White Horse Barn created from the conversion of an agricultural building.
5. The guidance in the Council's House Extensions and Garages Design Guide 2005 (the SPD), including its advice on house extensions in the countryside, is relevant to the proposed development despite its publication prior to the permitted development rights that enabled the conversion of the agricultural building.
6. The SPD advises that extensions should normally be subservient to the original house, be smaller in width, depth and height than the existing property and the eaves wall should generally be less than 2/3 length of the eaves wall of the host dwelling. In the countryside, the SPD advises that house extensions that extend the ground floor area of the original house by more than 50% will not normally be permitted unless there is an exceptional household need. Where the existing dwelling is an established conversion from a barn, or other rural

building, a far more restricted approach will be applied, because of the sensitivity of the design to retain an agricultural use appearance appropriate to the countryside. Exceptions to this may be made only where there is special justification.

7. Based on the figures provided by the appellant and Council, the proposed extension would approximately double the ground floor area. This clearly exceeds the figures in the SPD and no special justification has been provided.
8. Policy HS8 of the Harrogate District Local Plan 2014 – 2035, adopted 2020, (the Local Plan) is supportive of house extensions provided that there is no adverse impact to the character or appearance of the dwelling or the surrounding area. Policy HP3 of the Local Plan requires development to incorporate high quality design that protects, enhances or reinforces those characteristics, qualities and features that contribute to the local distinctiveness of the district's rural and urban environments.
9. The general design of the proposed extension takes its cue from other agricultural buildings that I observed in the local area and the materials proposed would blend in with the rural context. However, the proposed extension, although having a similar footprint to the shed located within the appeal site, would appear more domestic in nature, arising in particular from the French doors proposed in the west elevation. The combination of the size of the proposed extension and this more domestic element mean that the proposed extension would be an incongruously large addition to the host building that would change its character to one more obviously residential in character. The proposed development would be widely visible when viewed from the north including from the road leading from Staveley and the road that lies adjacent.
10. I acknowledge that the proposed extension would be on a similar footprint to the existing shed. However, the shed sits lower than the proposed extension would and has a relatively neutral effect on the character of the area given its simple form and appearance.
11. Consequently, the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the surrounding rural area. As such, it would conflict with Policies HS8 and HP3 of the Local Plan, the aims of which have been set out above. It would also conflict with the guidance in the SPD and the design objectives of the Framework.

Other Matters

12. I note the appellant's assertion that the host building would be a modest dwelling even with the proposed extension when compared to other properties in the area. Whilst this may be the case, it does not alter my view about the harm that would be caused to the host dwelling and wider area. I note the supporting comments made about the proposed development, but the points raised do not outweigh the harm that I have identified, in particular given my view about the relatively neutral effect of the shed.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

F Wilkinson

INSPECTOR