



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2021

by M Seaton DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E2734/D/20/3265929

Braithwaite Barn, Beckwith Lodge Farm, Beckwith, Harrogate, HG3 1QQ

- 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 Dave Hayton against the decision of Harrogate Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/03727/FUL, dated 28 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as retrospective amendment to approved planning application 20/00041 FUL; re-siting of garden room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is occupied by a detached barn comprising residential accommodation with associated outbuildings and structures. The site is set to the east of a passing lane from which vehicular access is taken, with the building the subject of the appeal set in close proximity to the stone wall boundary with the lane. The surrounding area exhibits an overriding rural character with the cluster of buildings situated on the appeal site and adjoining land set within an agricultural and rural landscape characterised by fields, paddocks, and punctuated by agricultural architecture.
4. Planning permission (*LPA Ref: 20/00041/FUL*) dated February 2020 was previously granted for the demolition of an outbuilding and the erection of a garden room which was indicated to be of the same design, in a location on the northern boundary of the appeal site, in alignment with the existing outbuildings leading from the main residential accommodation in the barn.
5. It is evident that a building of a larger footprint was demolished from the same position as the footprint of the appeal proposal in connection with the 2020 approval. However, I do not have any detailed information about the visual impact of the removed building beyond the size of its footprint. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that the positioning of the appeal building in its current location rather than as approved on the northern boundary of the site represents a

significant difference in the visual impact of development on the site, contrary to the contention of the appellant.

6. The position of the appeal scheme immediately facing towards the road appears as a visually prominent structure over the stone wall forming the main front boundary of the appeal site. This contrasts with the more recessed position as previously approved on the northern boundary within the existing alignment of outbuildings.
7. Despite the existing residential use and occupation of the site and buildings, there remains an overriding rural character as provided by the retained former agricultural buildings and barn. I recognise that the appeal building would still be located within the residential curtilage of the converted barn and that the materials which have been used are of an undoubted high quality. However, the fully glazed west elevation facing towards the road presents as a significantly greater visual intrusion within the retained rural character of the site and immediate environs. In this location, it appears as an obtrusive and overly domestic interjection within the area which the use of high-quality materials does not mitigate for within this context. The building is significantly more prominent than the previously approved scheme.
8. For these reasons, and despite recognising the design quality of the materials, the development results in an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area, including a limited visual impact on the wider landscape character. The development therefore conflicts with Policies NE4 and HP3 of the Harrogate District Local Plan 2014-2035. These policies seek to ensure that development incorporates high quality building that protects, enhances or reinforces the characteristics, qualities and features that contribute to the local distinctiveness of the district's rural environment, as well as protecting, enhancing or restoring the landscape character of Harrogate district. I also find there to be conflict with paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, the appeal must be dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR