



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2023

by N Kempton BAHons, PGDip, MA, IHBC, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/G2713/D/23/3320264

Bagby Grange, Bagby, Thirsk, North Yorkshire YO7 2AE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs A&C Mallory against the decision of Hambleton District Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/00066/FUL.
 - The development proposed is alterations and two-storey extension to the rear of existing dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Both parties were given the opportunity to comment on the amended National Planning Policy Framework, published in December 2023, and I have taken into account representations received.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a detached residential dwelling that was formerly a barn, which is an attractive feature in countryside located beyond the village of Bagby. To the rear of the building, the former function of this barn is apparent not least with the existence of two gables which project out from the principal range. Domesticity is evident in the later extensions, specifically a flat roof porch and a conservatory, and in the landscaped garden. The surrounding landscape comprises open agricultural land, a farm complex and residential dwellings.
5. The proposed two storey extension would project out from the rear roofslope of the former barn, obscuring the skyline above the roof line of the gables. Notwithstanding the reduction in the length and height of this projection, when viewed from the side elevation and in relation to the width of the gable of the barn, the scale and massing of the proposed development would constitute a disproportionate addition to the host building.
6. The overhanging eaves of the two-storey rear projection, with open timber work at the apex, coupled with the balcony atop the parapet wall of the single storey family room extension, lacks the identity and coherence of architectural

precedents that are prevalent in the rural locale. The overly wide aperture at ground floor, with the elongated lintel and wide glazed panels, exacerbates the scale of the projection. As such the proposed two storey extension would fail to assimilate with the host building, rather it would appear unduly dominant and discordant.

7. I note the intention to contain and group the proposed extension in an area that already has development by removing the existing conservatory and infilling the area between the two gingangs, thereby maintaining the front elevation of the former barn.
8. However, it would not mitigate the harm that would result from the proposed development. The extension would subsume the gingangs and project beyond the line of these distinctive features, thereby assuming undue prominence. The extension would abut the faceted roof form of the gingangs with an awkward junction, creating a tension with the gingangs in terms of scale and siting.
9. The proposed extension would fail to respect the articulation of the existing architectural forms. Rather, it would result in coalescence and loss of definition of the distinctive, traditional agricultural features. This would undermine the legibility of the form and function of the former barn and erode its character and appearance, which contributes to the distinctiveness of the rural, agricultural character of the countryside, of which traditional farm buildings are an integral part.
10. The bootroom extension would cover and replace the existing porch and entrance lobby. The height of the parapet to the boot room would be higher than the existing porch, which lines through with the eaves of the parent building. The lantern would be visible above the height of the parapet, beyond which, two rooflights are proposed to be installed in the roofslope of the parent building. The existing porch is a relatively incidental adjunct, whereas by comparison, the proposed bootroom is larger in scale and would cumulatively contribute to the disproportionate additions to this former barn.
11. For these reasons, the proposed development would be contrary to policy E1 of the Hambleton Local Plan (LP), which requires, amongst other things, all development to be of a high quality, to integrate successfully with its surroundings, respect and contribute positively to local character, identity and distinctiveness in terms of form, scale, layout, height, visual appearance and visual relationships. Furthermore, the proposed development is contrary to policy S5 of the LP, which states that a proposal for development for residential extension in the countryside must meet the requirements of policy E1: Design.

Other Matters

12. The palette of materials proposed are consistent with the host building. This does not however, negate the harm I have identified concerning the size, siting and design of the proposed development.
13. The appellant states that the proposed extensions represent a 20% uplift over the existing floor area. Even if this is found to be the case, my assessment is not solely based on a volumetric calculation. Empirical measurement is only part of my assessment. Rather my judgement of the case is based on assessment in context, an overall perception of the proposed development. As proposed, the overall composition and massing would be disproportionate to

the host building and would erode the architectural character and appearance of this former barn, to the detriment of its distinctive contribution to the character of the area.

14. The appellant draws comparison with a planning consent relating to a property in Huby. I do not have the full details of the considerations that led to that approval, and the architectural form parallels are limited, which restricts the weight I can afford this. I have determined this appeal based on the evidence before me.
15. With regards to the Domestic Extensions SPD, I have had regard to this guidance document and noted the precise wording. I have determined this appeal in accordance with policies in the Development Plan.

Conclusion

16. I acknowledge that the proposed development has been designed to meet a functional need for the appellant's family, and that it would replace existing structures. Notwithstanding this, I have found that by reason of the design, scale and location, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the architectural integrity of the host dwelling and on the character and appearance of the area.
17. I have considered the submitted evidence and for the reasons given above, I have determined that the development is contrary to the Development Plan when read as a whole, and there are no material considerations to indicate that a decision should be taken other than in accordance with that plan.
18. The appeal is dismissed.

N Kempton

INSPECTOR