
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2021

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E2734/D/21/3280598

Wood End, Nesfield, Ilkley LS29 0BU

- 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 Wright against the decision of Harrogate Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00659/FUL, dated 17 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is a second storey extension with rear staircase.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposal has been altered on the Council decision notice to the 'erection of first floor extension with staircase'. This description more accurately reflects the proposal and has been incorporated within the appeal form. I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Nesfield Conservation Area (the Conservation Area).

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to a residential dwelling which is located prominently within the street-scene by reason of its position overlooking West Hall Lane on the western edge of Nesfield. The property is located within the Conservation Area.
5. The Conservation Area Character Appraisal¹ (CACA) identifies the original building as dating from the early nineteenth century or possibly late eighteenth century, previously forming two cottages but since converted into a single dwelling. It is identified within the CACA as a building of local interest. The evidence indicates that the eastern side of the dwelling forms a more modern twentieth century construction.
6. The scale, form and detailing of the buildings within Nesfield are among the defining features of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
7. The original building is long established and makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. It is of traditional design and proportions, its front elevation incorporates a dominance of solid over void and it

¹ Harrogate Borough Council Nesfield Conservation Area Character Appraisal November 2011.

includes window openings that are taller than they are wide, which affords them a vertical emphasis.

8. The original building can be clearly distinguished from the later addition by reason of the significant setbacks of its building lines and set downs on its ridgelines, along with its lower eaves levels. This set up allows the original building to take prominence.
9. However, whilst the proposal would retain the significant setbacks and utilise matching materials, it would result in the provision of ridgelines that would only be slightly lesser in height than the original building. There would also be a homogenisation of eaves lines across the whole property.
10. This arrangement would grant the extension an unwarranted degree of prominence when viewed against the original building. This would be particularly harmful given the inclusion of windows of modern proportions and horizontal emphasis to the newly provided first floor and the awkward positioning of the front windows serving the first-floor extension above those immediately adjacent.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would detract from the appearance of the original building of local interest. It would subsequently detract from the heritage significance of the Conservation Area which lies in part with the scale, form and detailing of its buildings.
12. The harm to the significance of the Conservation Area would be less than substantial. Paragraph 202 of the Framework² requires such harm to be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal.
13. The benefits of this scheme would be limited to the provision of increased living space at the appeal property. However, any benefit of increased space would primarily be a personal one for the appellant. Given the degree of harm I have found that would arise from the appeal scheme and the statutory protection afforded to Conservation Areas, such benefit is not sufficient to outweigh this harm.
14. The development would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The extension would therefore fail to accord with policies HP2, HP3 and HS8 of the Harrogate District Local Plan (2020) which amongst other things require development that is appropriate to the character of an area which enhances or reinforces those characteristics, qualities and features that contribute to the local distinctiveness and which protects heritage assets.

Conclusion

15. The extension would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Conservation Area and no public benefits would outweigh this harm.
16. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal should therefore be dismissed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR

² National Planning Policy Framework 2021.