



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 November 2024 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by Chris Forrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/D/24/3352609

The Barn, Ure Bank Terrace, Ripon, North Yorkshire HG4 1JG

- 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 and Mrs Morris against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZC24/01932/FUL.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area, with particular regard to the Ripon Conservation Area (CA) and the character of the Special Landscape area of the Ure Valley (CSL).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The CA covers a large part of the centre of Ripon. From the evidence before me and my observations on site, the significance of the CA is largely derived from the number of high-quality traditional buildings, together with the retention of original materials, and the siting of the buildings and their relationship to each other. 'The Barn' is a group of various former agricultural buildings which have been converted to form one residential dwelling. It is situated on Ure Bank terrace, a residential street situated on the periphery of the conservation area, which consists of a variety of differing residential properties which creates a pleasant character and appearance and makes a significant positive contribution to the character of the CA.
5. The dwelling itself holds a linear form with the two-storey element comprising of the principal elevation, and then accompanying single storey elements to the side and rear which has been retained as part of the conversion. The area where the extension is proposed currently has habitable accommodation within the roof space, but the scale of the building remains that of a single storey structure. As a result, the dwelling has a stepped roof form with differing roof

types which contributes positively to its character and appearance as a converted barn.

6. The proposed first floor extension would involve the raising of the walls and roof height and would introduce an elongated gable roof form. The resultant development would be a large overly domestic addition which would significantly alter the character of the existing building and its simple form and design in a manner which would be an unsympathetic and inappropriate addition. This is principally owing to the significant increase in massing from the increased wall height alongside Ure Bank Terrace together with the extent of its projection from the main part of the dwelling. As a result, it would also detract from the buildings immediate setting and views from Ure Bank Terrace and the CA.
7. In coming to the above view, I acknowledge that the ridge height of the resultant building would be lower than that of the main part of the dwelling and to that extent it would exhibit a level of subserviency. However, the sheer size and massing of the extended building would result in a development which fails to be a subservient addition overall which the existing low-level building currently provides.
8. Turning to the proposed materials and fenestration, the use of timber and large window openings would be viewed in stark contrast with the existing dwelling's traditional material palette and modest window proportions. Although the site has timber outbuildings and fencing, the choice of timber for the extension would be at odds with the predominant character of the existing building which is constructed with brickwork. The use of timber cladding further adds to the visual dominance of the proposal and the harm to the CA.
9. Whilst the large fenestration details would have limited public visibility, I am conscious that some views would be possible from the Public Right of Way on the opposite side of the River Ure. This would be particularly the case at times of the year when foliage is reduced.
10. The Council has also referred to the CSL in their decision. However, very limited information in respect of this has been provided. Notwithstanding that, I have already identified that the proposal would harm the character of the wider area. Given the location of the site within the CSL, it follows that the proposal would also harm this special landscape area. That said, the level of harm is clearly minor. Nevertheless, some harm would result.
11. In the context of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), the level of harm I have identified must be considered to be less than substantial. Paragraph 215 of the Framework states that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset (such as the CA), this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
12. Whilst the development would no doubt deliver a better standard of accommodation for the appellant, this is not a public benefit as such. The prospect of improving the thermal envelope of the building could be considered to have some public benefit (through the reduction of the need for energy). However, this benefit is clearly very limited.

13. Taking these benefits into account, I am of the opinion that the public benefits of the development, do not outweigh the harm I have identified to the character of the CA, the host building or the wider area.
14. Consequently, I find that the first-floor extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area, including the CA. Accordingly, the scheme conflicts with the Framework and Policies HP2, HP3 and NE4 of the Harrogate District Local Plan 2014 -2035 (2020) which, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that that proposals affecting a conservation area protect and, where appropriate, enhance those elements that have been identified as making a positive contribution to the character and special architectural or historic interest of the area and its setting.

Other Matters

15. My attention has been drawn to other developments in the area, including River House (20 Ure Bank Terrace), 'Squirrel Lodge' and the C19 Maltings on the adjacent street Ure Bank Top.
16. In respect of River House, I acknowledge the fenestration details at that property. However, the context of this property is different to that of the appeal dwelling which is a converted farm building where more modest openings are to be expected.
17. From the evidence before me, Squirrel Lodge lies outside of the CA and as such has a significantly different context to the appeal site. The type and style of building for the C19 Maltings, being an industrial style building, is also not directly comparable to the design of the appeal scheme.
18. Taking these factors into account, none of these properties provide for a compelling reason to permit an otherwise unacceptable scheme.

Conclusion and Recommendation

19. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

20. I have considered all the submitted evidence, and my representative's report, and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR