



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2022

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/E2734/D/22/3309469

White Horse Barn, Arkendale Road, Staveley HG5 9JU

- 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 Mandy Umpleby against the decision of Harrogate Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/04592/FUL, dated 18 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is extension to existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extension to existing dwelling at White Horse Barn, Arkendale Road, Staveley HG5 9JU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/04592/FUL, dated 18 October 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 plan: 009 Rev E.

Procedural Matter

2. The scheme was amended during the course of the planning application. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of the amended plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on a rural lane, a short distance outside the village of Staveley. I am advised that it was previously part of a small farmstead containing two modern steel-framed agricultural buildings that have recently been converted into three dwellings under permitted development rights. Whilst the buildings retain some hint of their agricultural origins, they are clearly a residential development with an overtly modern character.
5. The Council refers to its House Extensions and Garages Design Guide (2005) (the SPD), which requires extensions to appear subservient to the original house and states that extensions to houses in the countryside should not normally extend the ground floor area of the original house by more than 50%.

6. Although the proposed extension would increase the length of the host building by around 7 metres, this increase would not exceed 50% of the original ground floor area. Its form and proportions would reflect the host building, and it would be set in from the sides and have a lower ridge and eaves height. As a result, the extension would appear subordinate and in proportion to the original building. The contrast of the proposed profiled metal sheet cladding with the existing timber cladding would further assist in breaking up the expanse of the building and add some visual interest.
7. The extension would be taller and more visible than the existing stables building it would replace, but for the reasons above, it would appear as a sympathetic and well-designed addition to the host building. It would not extend beyond the confines of the site and would be viewed with and against other residential properties. As such, the development would assimilate into the existing built form and would not have an unduly urbanising effect, or lead to any harm to the spatial quality of the area.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the development would not harm the character or appearance of the host building and surrounding area. It would thus comply with the design requirements of Policies HP3 and HS8 of the Harrogate District Local Plan (2020), and the SPD, the relevant parts of which require new development to protect local distinctiveness and to ensure that extensions do not have an adverse impact on the character or appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area. It also complies with the National Planning Policy Framework with regards to achieving well designed places.

Other Matters

9. I have noted the concerns raised by neighbouring residents in relation to loss of light, outlook, privacy, parking, and future intentions for the use of the property. However, these matters did not feature in the Council's reasons for refusal, and having carefully considered the scale and nature of the development, its fenestration arrangement, and the site's orientation to neighbouring properties, I have no reason to disagree with the Council's assessment of these matters and therefore find no harm in these regards.
10. I have had regard to the previous appeal decision at the site (APP/E2734/D/21/3272299), but due to significant differences in the scale and design of the proposal, it has limited bearing on my assessment of this appeal.

Conditions

11. The only conditions suggested by the Council are the standard commencement and approved plans conditions, which I have imposed for certainty.

Conclusion

12. The proposal complies with the relevant policies of the development plan, and therefore with the development plan as a whole. Accordingly, and for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR