



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 December 2024

by Paul Martinson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/D/24/3354942

27 Cautley Drive, Killinghall, North Yorkshire HG3 2DJ

- 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 Yean Cheant Lim against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZC24/02046/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'Proposed 2 storey front extension'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Cautley Drive is a residential cul-de-sac located on the fringes of Killinghall. Whilst those dwellings closest to the junction with Otley Road to the east are older, the dwellings closer to the appeal site are of much more recent construction. These comprise of a mix of predominantly two storey, detached, semi-detached and terraced properties. These are mainly faced with red brick although some rendered and yellow brick dwellings were also present. The dwellings comprise of a variety of different designs, although feature gables to the front elevations are prevalent. Where present, these are typically to two storey height and project out a short distance from the remainder of the front elevation.
4. The appeal site is located on a small offshoot of Cautley Drive, comprising of four detached dwellings arranged in a linear fashion and accessed by a narrow access road off a turning head. The access road closely follows the boundary line of the adjacent Killinghall Cricket Club cricket field, a large open grassed area that is primarily accessed from Otley Road.
5. The four properties, whilst all slightly different, have a consistent forward building line and share a number of design features. Although fenestration design varies across the four properties, fenestration is generally in the same position and of the same proportions, with a horizontal emphasis. First floor windows generally reflect the scale and proportions of those at ground floor. As is characteristic here, each dwelling has a pair of feature gables to the front, set either side of the entrance door. Being wider and projecting out further from the rest of the elevation, the right gable is the more dominant of the two.

6. The gables, alongside their similar materials and fenestration provide a degree of consistency and symmetry that is present across the four properties which are seen in a continuous row in views from the access road, the cricket field and from the access along Otley Road serving the Cricket Club. In all of these views, the consistency and symmetry of the row of dwellings provides a degree of coherence to the streetscene and ensures that they contribute positively to its character and appearance.
7. The proposed two storey extension would be a sizeable addition to the front elevation, projecting out a significant distance from the existing front elevation of the smaller feature gable. The extension would incorporate a new third gable, much narrower than the existing two gables, and would infill the space between them. This would project out further still and would result in an awkward junction of the eaves to either side of the proposed gable, contributing to unbalanced, asymmetrical appearance. The proposed alterations to the first floor window openings to the front elevation would result in windows with a vertical emphasis and radically different scale and proportions to the existing windows or those at the neighbouring properties within the row.
8. As such, the scale, proposed fenestration, awkward juxtaposition of the gables, and the siting of the proposed extensions, set well forward of the existing projecting gable, would be poorly related to the existing dwelling and would represent an incongruous form of development that would be at odds with the character of the existing row of dwellings here. This incongruity would be highly evident in views from the Cricket Club access along Otley Road, the cricket field and the access road forward of the existing row of dwellings, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the streetscene.
9. The Harrogate House Extensions and Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD) sets out that the siting of new development should respect existing building lines, the pattern of buildings and the spaces between them. Moreover, it guides that there is a strong presumption against extending the front of a house and that such extensions will only be permitted where frontal projections are commonplace in the immediate area. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would conflict with this guidance. This reinforces my above assessment.
10. For the above reasons, the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy HP3 of the Harrogate District Local Plan (2020) which seeks to ensure new development constitutes high quality design that protects, enhances or reinforces those characteristics, qualities and features that contribute to local distinctiveness. For the same reasons, the proposal would also conflict with the guidance contained within the SPD, set out above.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has referred to a lack of communication from the Council during the period of the consideration of the application. This however relates to the practical administration of the application rather than to the acceptability of the scheme. Whilst I have noted that history, I have nonetheless determined the appeal scheme with regard to its planning merits.
12. I have had regard to the appellant's comments regarding the need for protection during times when the cricket pitch is in use. However, these requirements do not

justify the harm to the streetscene and there is nothing to indicate that the appeal scheme is the only means of addressing this matter.

Conclusion

13. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan. There are no material considerations that indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Martinson

INSPECTOR