



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2022

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E2734/D/21/3286235

14 St Johns Grove, Kirk Hammerton, York YO26 8DE

- 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 Ms Abigail Rogers against the decision of Harrogate Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/04012/FUL, dated 10 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is described on the planning application form as "amended and compromised application for single storey kitchen extension with pantiled monopitch roof + extended living area (to replace ex PVC conservatory with additional bedroom at first floor)".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council requested that I view the appeal site from 15 St Johns Grove, and I was able to do so at my visit.
3. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the:
 - Character and appearance of the host building and the streetscape; and
 - Living conditions of residents of No 15 in respect of outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

5. The appeal site is a semi-detached dwelling located in a cul-de-sac. The design of the dwelling reflects that of its immediate neighbours, with a main pitched roof with relatively low eaves, and a side gable offshoot extending to first floor level.

6. The proposal would consist of a two storey extension wrapping around the corner of the building. It would project further to the side than the existing gable offshoot, and would include an extent of flank wall at first floor level with a hipped roof. Although the proposal would be located to the side and rear, due to the layout of the cul-de-sac the extension would be readily visible from the streetscape.
7. Within this relatively prominent location, the proposal would appear as a bulky and incongruous addition to the host building due to the degree of projection to the side, the contrasting hipped roof design, and the arrangement of the extension as it wraps around the corner of the building. The extent of flank wall at first floor level would add to this obtrusive appearance. The proposal would therefore create an extension that would contrast uncomfortably with the side elevation and roof form of the host building as well as conflicting with the appearance of its immediate neighbours.
8. Some of the dwellings within this cul-de-sac have been extended at both ground and first floor level. However, some of the extensions I saw at first floor level served to confirm the harm that can arise to character and appearance from extensions of an unsuitable design.
9. It is proposed to use materials that match with the existing dwelling and remove the conservatory. However, this would do little to mitigate for the incongruous design of the proposal.
10. I conclude that, due to its design and location, the proposed extension would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the streetscape. The proposal would therefore conflict with policies HP3 and HS8 of the Harrogate District Local Plan 2020 (the Local Plan) as well as the advice of the House Extensions and Garages Design Guide 2005 (the Design Guide) which together seek to ensure that house extensions are of a high quality design and do not have an adverse impact on the character or appearance of the dwelling or the surrounding area.

Living Conditions

11. The side wall of the proposed extension would project closer towards No 15 than the existing dwelling.
12. However, the extension would be set back from the boundary which would go some way towards mitigating a potentially overbearing effect on the neighbouring property. Furthermore, the extension would project towards an amenity area of limited size to the side of No 15, and would have a minimal effect on the remaining area of the relatively extensive garden of the neighbouring property.
13. Due to the arrangement of the properties, the extension would also not be readily apparent from habitable rooms within the dwelling of No 15.
14. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the living conditions of residents of No 15 with regards to outlook. The proposal would therefore comply with policies HP4 and HS8 of the Local Plan as well as the advice of the Design Guide with regards to the consideration of residential amenity.

Conclusion

15. Notwithstanding my conclusions in respect of living conditions, the proposal would lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the streetscape. The proposal would therefore conflict with the development plan as a whole with regards to the high quality design of extensions to dwellings.
16. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR