
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2022

by D Hartley BA (Hons) MTP MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C2708/D/22/3307829

32 Princes Drive, Skipton BD23 1HL

- 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 Michael and Jennifer Pighills against the decision of Craven District Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/24280/HH, dated 2 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 28 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension at 32 Princes Drive, Skipton, BD23 1HL, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2022/24280/HH, dated 2 August 2022, subject to the following conditions.
 - (i) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of two years from the date of this permission.
 - (ii) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following approved plans: drawing No 21/41/06A (proposed site / roof plan and location plan), drawing No 21/41/04B (proposed first floor plan) and drawing No 21/41/03A (proposed ground floor plan).

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling and falls within Princes Drive which includes similarly designed semi-detached houses with hipped roofs and with partly stone and partly pebble dashed walls. There is an architectural consistency to the appearance of dwellings in this street. The properties are set well back from the road and in a linear form. They are positioned within spacious plot and have landscaped front gardens with low stone walls abutting the highway.
4. Some of the dwellings in this street have been extended to the side (e.g. 1, 12, 30, 50, 52, 54 and 58 Princes Drive), but overall there remains a regularity of open gaps between the blocks of dwellings and the two storey side extensions appear subordinate in scale to the host properties and retain the character and

appearance of the original dwellings. Collectively, the above attributes add positively and distinctively to the character and appearance of the immediate area.

5. The proposed two storey side extension would have a hipped roof thereby assimilating well with the design of the existing property. Such a roof would be set down from the ridge of the main roof of the property. While the ground floor of the extension would be flush with the front wall of the main house, the first floor element of the extension would be positioned 1 metre back from the front wall of the host property. The extension would be similar, if not identical, to that approved and constructed at No 30 Princes Drive (i.e. the adjoining semi-detached property). It is of note that in considering the aforementioned development in 2016¹, the Council commented in its officer report that this neighbouring extension would '*not have a great impact upon the street scene as similar schemes have been implemented on other surrounding properties in the area*'.
6. I find that owing to the first floor of the extension being set back from the front wall of the original house, coupled with the stepping down of its roof, it would appear subordinate in scale to the host property. Furthermore, the extension would not upset the balance or symmetry of the pair of semi-detached dwellings. In fact, the proposal would seek to replicate what has been approved at No 30 Princes Drive and, to this extent, it would have the effect of appropriately balancing the design and appearance of the two dwellings.
7. The Council raises concern about the effect of the development on open gaps between dwellings in the area and assert that the proposal would result in a continuous built frontage and a 'terracing' effect. Given the set back at first floor level and the lower hipped roof, I do not agree that the extension would be appreciated as a long or continuous built frontage. Indeed, this is not the case when the extension at No 30 Princes Drive is experienced in the street-scene.
8. As regards open gaps between properties, I was able to observe as part of my site visit that No 34 Princes Drive does not include a two storey side extension and instead there is undeveloped land in the form of a drive. In this respect, and while the development would extend up to the boundary with No 34 Princes Drive, I do not find that the proposal would have the effect of departing unacceptably from the open gaps between properties, or that it would result in a terracing effect when seen within the street-scene.
9. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposal would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore accord with the design, character and appearance requirements of policy ENV3 of the adopted Craven Local Plan 2012-2032 and Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

Other Matters

10. I have taken into account the representation received from the owner of No 34 Princes Drive. As part of my site visit, I was able to appreciate the relationship between this property and the appeal extension. On the evidence that is before me, I concur with the findings of the local planning authority that while there

¹ Planning application ref 63/2016/16831

may be some loss of sunlight and daylight to this neighbouring property, this would be limited in extent and would not in itself justify withholding planning permission. In reaching this view, it is not disputed that the windows to the side elevation of No 34 Princes Drive serve non-habitable rooms. Overall, I am satisfied that the extension would not cause any material harm to the occupiers of No 34 Princes Drive in respect of light, privacy or outlook.

11. The owner of No 34 Princes Drive has commented that a section of existing hedge line along the front west boundary would need to be removed and that they would not agree to this. Should this be required, it would fall to be a private matter to be discussed between the two parties. The grant of planning permission would not override any possible land and property rights issues between neighbours.
12. None of the other matters raised alter or outweigh my conclusion on the main issue.

Conditions

13. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three year time limit condition. It is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. I have therefore imposed a condition to this effect.

Conclusion

14. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

D Hartley

INSPECTOR