



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 March 2022

by Richard Newsome BA (Hons) MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E2734/D/21/3289620

The Old Forge, Hebden Bank, Sawley, Ripon HG4 3ED

- 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 & Mrs M Button against the decision of Harrogate Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/04244/FUL, dated 27 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is rear extension and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for rear extension and associated works at The Old Forge, Hebden Bank, Sawley, Ripon HG4 3ED in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/04244/FUL, dated 27 September 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - 20/08/2034 01 Site Location Plans (Feb 2021)
 - 20/08/2034 02 Existing Plans & Elevations (Jan 2021)
 - 20/08/2034 05 Rev G Proposed Plans & Elevations (17.09.21)

Procedural Matters

2. The application form and appeal form both identified the appeal property as being on Bebden Bank. The appellants have clarified the address, which is shown above.
3. I noted inconsistencies between the number and location of proposed roof lights on two submitted plans. The appellants have clarified that plan 20/08/2034 05 Rev G Proposed Plans & Elevations (17.09.21) shows the correct proposed roof light arrangement to be determined. They also clarified that the other plan, 20/08/2034 04 Rev D Proposed Site Plan (08.06.21), was only submitted for information and does not form part of the appeal proposal. Therefore, I have not listed it as an approved plan in Condition 2.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area, with specific regard to the Nidderdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

Reasons

5. The Council has granted planning permission (Ref 21/00698/FUL) for a similar scheme to the proposal. The main differences between the two relate to the height and resulting appearance of the rear stone extension. Whilst it would be taller than the existing garage, and the previously approved scheme, the ridge line and eaves of the roof of the proposed rear stone extension would still be set down appropriately from the 2-storey element of the host dwelling. This, coupled with its location to the rear of the appeal property, would ensure that it would be subservient and result in an acceptable building hierarchy.
6. There would without doubt also be an increased difference in height between the proposed glazed link and the adjacent rear stone extension compared to the previously approved scheme. However, I do not find that this would unacceptably accentuate the relative height of the stone extension or diminish its subservience to the clearly more dominant 2-storey element of the host dwelling.
7. The appeal scheme would result in areas of exposed stone between the top of the ground floor openings and eaves of the roof on the eastern and western elevations of the rear stone extension. However, the overall design and the lower ratio of openings to walls in these elevations would assist in differentiating the extension from the host dwelling and contribute further to its subservience.
8. The proposed development would be visible from certain public locations on Hebden Bank and a nearby public bridleway. However, views would be localised and thus limited. The proposal would be screened to a degree from Hebden Bank by intervening trees and a boundary wall, and from parts of the public bridleway by intervening trees, structures in the rear gardens of adjacent properties, and the landscape to the rear of the appeal property.
9. The scale, location and relative obscurity of the proposed development would, for the reasons I have set out, not result in harm to the design of the host dwelling, the immediate area, or the landscape or scenic beauty of the AONB. As such, it would comply with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and Policies GS6, HP3, and NE4 of the Harrogate District Local Plan (2020) (HDLP) which collectively seek to restore, conserve, and enhance local distinctiveness and the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB. The proposal would also accord with Policy HS8 of the HDLP and the principles of the Council's House Extensions and Garages Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2005) which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development is of a quality design and does not adversely impact the character or appearance of a dwelling and the surrounding area.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against the tests set out in paragraph 56 of the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard commencement condition, I consider a condition in respect of the development being in accordance with the approved plans is necessary. These have been applied for the avoidance of doubt as to what has been approved.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given, the appeal scheme would comply with the development plan. As such, the appeal should be allowed.

Richard Newsome

INSPECTOR