



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 December 2022

by Diane Cragg Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E2734/D/22/3306023

5 Burton Cottages, Humberton, Helperby, York, North Yorkshire YO61 2RZ

- 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 Phil McBride against the decision of Harrogate Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01236/FUL, dated 21 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of 1 no two storey extension and 1 no single storey extension and alterations to roof and fenestration to create annexe (granny flat).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant has confirmed that the description of the development has changed, therefore, I have taken the description in the banner heading from the appeal form and determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. No 5 Burton Cottages (No 5) is a semi-detached two storey dwelling fronting Burton Lane, a country lane between villages. The appeal property is part of a small group of cottages sited close to the lane frontage and surrounded by open, agricultural fields. As a consequence, the cottages, including the appeal property, are notable features in the landscape.
5. No 5 and its attached neighbour have been extended differently, however, both properties retain prominent steeply pitched front, rear, and side gable roofs and attractive brick work detailing at the eaves line. These features, particularly the front and rear gable details, maintain a certain symmetry between the properties that contributes to the character and appearance of the area.
6. Although the extensions would be constructed of matching materials, the proposed two-storey extension would be sited flush with the cottage's front wall, would have a significant width when compared with the existing front first floor elevation of the cottage and introduce a relatively shallow pitched gable elevation facing towards the side garden. Further, the extension would cut into

the gable eaves line at the front and rear foreshortening the gables to one side and would require the removal of brick detailing to the front gable. As a result of its size, siting and design the two-storey extension would dominate the existing structure, would be incongruous with the size and design of the cottage and undermine the balanced appearance of the semi-detached pair.

7. Whilst the single storey extension would be set back from the road and would not, of itself, appear incongruous from the street, taken together with the two-storey addition the proposed development would notably alter the property's scale and appearance and would overwhelm the existing structure. Consequently, the extensions would not be sympathetic to the form or distinctive features of the existing cottage, the inappropriate design and size of the proposal would draw attention, and, because of the dwelling's prominent position, the extensions would look harmfully out of place.
8. Although the appellant indicates that there are similar extensions in the area, no specific examples have been brought to my attention and I did not observe any in the immediate vicinity of the appeal property at my site visit.
9. Overall, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area in conflict with Policies HP3 and HS8 of the Harrogate District Local Plan 2014 – 2035, where these policies seek to protect local distinctiveness and ensure extensions are designed to be in sympathy with the original building. It would also conflict with the House Extensions & Garages Design Guide which seeks to achieve good design by, amongst other things, ensuring extensions are subservient to the original house.

Other Matters

10. I appreciate that the appellant proposes to provide accommodation to support his mother. However, the extension is not solely for this purpose, and I have no evidence before me that an extension of a different design could not achieve the required annexe accommodation.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR