



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 13 September 2021 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E2734/D/21/3276562

Low Gables, Galphay Village, Galphay, HG4 3NJ

- 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 Robbie Donaldson against the decision of Harrogate Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00477/FUL, dated 5 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as loft conversion, erection of 3 no. dormer windows to the rear roof slope and the installation of 4no.rooflights to the front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. Amended plans were submitted during the consideration of the application, to change the proposed dormer from a single flat roof dormer to three pitched roof dormers. These amended plans were fully considered by the Council in determining the application and I have therefore considered the appeal on the same basis.
4. I note that the decision notice refers to the Council Guidelines on Equestrian Development in Nidderdale AONB Supplementary Planning Document, whereas the evidence includes the House Extension and Garages Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). The appellant also refers to this guidance and I am satisfied that my consideration of it would not cause prejudice to him in this regard.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the locality including the Nidderdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. Low Gables is a detached single storey dwelling located centrally within the village of Galphay. It is set back from the road running through the village

with a garden area to its southern elevation and can also be viewed from the northern elevation where it is set down from the road and accessed via a driveway.

7. Although there is dispute between the parties as to the location of the new dormer windows, I consider that they would be located on the rear elevation of the bungalow. They would cover a large part of the roof and would have a similar ridge height to the existing property. As a consequence of their design and size they would significantly alter the roof scape of the bungalow and would result in top heavy, bulky, dominant additions which would significantly alter the simple roof profile of the dwelling.
8. Moreover, whilst set back from the road behind a garden area, the dormers would be visible in the street scene, from the roads to the front and rear of the property, from where they would appear as prominent, incongruous additions. The contribution that the host dwelling makes to the character and appearance of the area would be eroded as a result of the proposal.
9. The appeal site is located within the Nidderdale AONB. Paragraph 176 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) gives great weight to conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty of such areas which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. As the appeal concerns alterations to an existing building within a village, I am satisfied that it would not have an adverse effect on this protected area.
10. The matters advanced by the appellant including the provision of additional internal space for his family are noted, however it is likely that the proposal is not the only option available to the appellant to achieve this.
11. I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and locality. It would therefore conflict with policies NE4 and HP3, of the Harrogate District Local Plan which together require development to enhance or reinforce local distinctiveness. There would also be conflict with the guidance on dormer and roof extensions in the SPD and the high-quality design aims of the Framework.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that outweigh this conflict. I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR