



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2023

by K L Robbie BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/E2734/D/22/3308815

The Forge, Asenby Forge to Park Road, Asenby, North Yorkshire YO7 3QL

- 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 Christian Brundell against the decision of Harrogate Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01769/FUL, dated 2 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey and double storey side extensions, new detached garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant has noted that the decision notice does not explicitly set out the drawings and documents upon which the application was determined. However, subsequent appeal documentation provided by the Council corresponds with the detail submitted by the appellant and I have determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property sits on a substantial plot on the inside of the junction of Dishforth Road and Carr Lane. The existing dwelling and the detached outbuilding that it is proposed to demolish to facilitate the proposed extension, which stand apart from each other on either side of a gated access drive, are prominently sited close to both road frontages.
5. The main house and the existing outbuilding are both pleasingly modest structures and are broadly similar in scale. Whilst the outbuilding is clearly in a poor state of repair, its charm and character are clear to see. Both it and the main house are situated unobtrusively together as part of a small group.
6. The appellant has sought to reflect elements of the existing outbuilding within the design of the proposed extension, a general approach that Policies HP3 and HS8 of the Harrogate District Local Plan (HDLP) seek to encourage. Thus, a two-storey peaked bay would extend above the lower single storey roofline on either side whilst a cart-door opening at ground floor would replicate features found on the existing building. This element of the proposal would also appear

to be broadly comparable with the existing outbuilding in terms of its footprint size and, in its replicated form, would be set further back from the roadside than the existing front elevation of the outbuilding.

7. However, the proposal would result in an unnaturally sprawling and incongruously large extension to what is otherwise a modest dwelling. Whilst the house and outbuilding are currently situated with space between them, the extension would incorporate a flat-roofed link element to link the existing house to the large 'wing'. Although maintaining, from some angles, a sense of separation, the proposed development would nevertheless be seen clearly as an extension. As such, the scale of the 'wing' would sit uncomfortably with that of the main house.
8. Although it has been stated that the extension has been designed to appear familiar, it nevertheless lacks the charm and subtlety of the existing outbuilding. The single storey ridge line would be the same on either side of the two-storey bay, unlike the existing arrangement, and this would add bulk to roofline of the resulting extension, whilst the slight set-back on the left-hand side of the central bay would not be carried across to the extension. Although minor details, the cumulative effect of this significantly alters the balance of proportions between the two main elements of the extended building.
9. It may be the case, as the appellant suggests, that a volumetric comparison of the existing outbuilding with this particular element of the extension reveals a smaller form than that which it would replace. However, in visual terms the extension would not appear subservient to the main house, whilst the overall width of the extended property creates a somewhat rambling form at odds with the modest character of the existing house.
10. HDLP Policies HP3 and HS8 set out the Council's approach to securing high-quality design that enhances and reinforces characteristics, qualities and features that contribute to local distinctiveness. Proposals should respond positively to the built form, respect the scale and appearance of spaces about and between buildings and avoid an adverse impact on the character or appearance of the dwelling or the surrounding area. The Council's 'House Extensions & Garages' Design Guide provides further advice and guidance to help secure high-quality design, setting out a range of general design principles for domestic extensions. For the reasons set out, the proposal would fail to achieve these aims, and would thus be contrary to HDLP policies HP3 and HS8.
11. The Council do not object to the detached garage, nor has concern been raised regarding the detailing of the proposal in terms of its materials and fenestration. Nor is there any dispute between the parties that there would be no harmful effect in terms of privacy or living conditions or that highway safety would not be prejudiced by the proposal. However, these factors are not sufficient to overcome the harm to the character and appearance that I have identified above.
12. I therefore find that the proposal would be of an incongruously excessive scale and would thus adversely affect the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. As such the proposal is contrary to HDLP policies HP3 and HS8, which seek to protect the character and appearance of buildings and their surroundings with particular regard to the scale, appearance and use of spaces about and between buildings or structures.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, having considered the development plan as a whole, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

KL Robbie

INSPECTOR