



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 June 2022

by S Brook BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V2723/D/22/3296212

90 Dale Grove, Leyburn DL8 5GA

- 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 Tunstall against the decision of Richmondshire District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00018/FULL, dated 9 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as 'lifting of proposed roof to allow additional space for 2 more bedrooms on new floor'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for lifting of proposed roof to allow additional space for 2 more bedrooms on new floor at 90 Dale Grove, Leyburn DL8 5GA, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/00018/FULL, dated 9 January 2022, and the plans submitted with it, 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 approved plans Drawing No D018A-PP01 and Drawing No D018A-SLP01.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. The plans provided include details of a single and 2 storey rear extension. These works do not form part of the description of this development and the submitted information confirms that these works already benefit from planning permission. Therefore, this decision considers only the development as described above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling, the attached property, and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a 2 storey semi-detached dwelling that shares a symmetry in terms of its appearance with the attached property. It sits within a modern housing estate where dwellings are a mix of one, 2 and 3 storeys, formed by short terraces, semi-detached, and detached properties. Visual interest within the estate has been created using various techniques. These include staggered set back distances from the highway, as well as varying building heights and roof forms, including dormer windows of differing styles.
5. The increased height resulting from the proposed development would change the symmetry and balance of this pair of semi-detached dwellings. However, the character and appearance of the estate is provided in part by buildings of varying height. At the site visit, I noted several examples of 2 storey dwellings positioned adjacent to 3 storey dwellings, in a variety of forms. The proposed development would not exactly replicate any of these examples. Nevertheless, given the variety of building heights present within the estate, I do not consider that the resulting appearance of the proposed 3 storey development seen alongside the adjoining 2 storey property, would be at odds with the character and appearance of the area. Noting the style and positioning of fenestration, the roof shape and the materials, the design of the proposed development means that it is also sympathetic to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the attached neighbour.
6. Whilst the appeal property sits close to a junction and a bend in the main road through the estate, it does not sit forward of neighbouring dwellings and so is no more prominent than other properties. Whilst the dwellings within this part of the estate are mainly 2 storeys high, there are some 3 storey dwellings near to the appeal site. There is an existing 3 storey dwelling within the same cul-de-sac and one diagonally opposite. When viewed from the north, the proposed development would be seen with the dwellings opposite, which sit at a higher ground level. In this context, the proposed development would not appear visually discordant or obtrusive in this location.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed development provides an acceptable standard of design that would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property, the adjoining property, or the surrounding area. Accordingly, I find that it complies with Policies CP3, CP4 and CP13 of the Richmondshire Local Plan 2012-2028 Core Strategy (adopted 9 December 2014), which collectively seek to promote high quality development that respects and enhances local context and does not adversely impact on the character of a settlement. Nor do I find any conflict with relevant paragraphs and policies of the National Planning Policy Framework which seek good design, sympathetic to the local area, or with relevant guidance contained within the National Planning Practice Guidance.

Conditions

8. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council. I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring matching materials to safeguard the character and appearance of the appeal property and surrounding area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

S Brook

INSPECTOR