



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2025

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date 7th August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/W/25/3366558

22 Strawberry Dale, Harrogate HG1 5EF

- 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 C Burrows (CBS Properties Ltd) against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is ZC25/00143/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of a two-storey attached dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development used in this decision is taken from the appeal forms and the Council's decision notice, as it more accurately reflects the proposal than the original description on the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Harrogate Conservation Area (the HCA).

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies within the HCA, which derives some of its special interest and significance from its historic development as a spa town, architectural variety, open spaces, and coherent townscape. According to the Harrogate Conservation Area Appraisal (2010), the site sits at the boundary between Character Area A (Town Centre, Low Harrogate & Victoria Park Estate) and Character Area B (North-East Residential Area). This part of the HCA is defined by continuous terraces with modest yards, contributing to a dense and compact urban grain.
5. 22 Strawberry Dale is an end-of-terrace dwelling with a side garden that provides visual separation to the substantial concrete retaining wall of the nearby railway embankment. The chamfered gable of the property aligns with the perpendicular frontages of Woodbine Terrace and Nidd Vale Terrace, reinforcing a coherent pattern of development. This relationship is especially evident from the narrow pedestrian passageway between the site and the embankment, and contributes positively to the spatial character of the area.
6. While the proposed dwelling would replicate the materials and fenestration of the host building, it would project significantly beyond the established building line of the perpendicular terraces. This would result in a visually dominant and enclosing

form, eroding the openness adjacent to the railway embankment and disrupting the spatial rhythm of the area.

7. Although planning permission has previously been granted for a single-storey side extension, that scheme would be set back and of lesser scale, thereby retaining a degree of openness. The proposed two-storey dwelling, by contrast, would introduce a more substantial and visually assertive built form that would diminish the visual relief currently provided by the side garden.
8. The appellant contends that the site is visually contained and contributes minimally to the wider HCA. However, the significance of the HCA lies not only in prominent views but also in the cumulative quality of its townscape and the relationships between buildings and spaces. Even modest elements, such as this side garden, contribute meaningfully to the overall character and appearance of the area.
9. The harm to the significance of the HCA would be limited in extent and can be classed as less than substantial. Nevertheless, even less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset must be given considerable importance and weight.
10. I identify the public benefits arising from the provision of a dwelling later in this decision. However, I do not find that the public benefits of the proposal outweigh the identified heritage harm.
11. In line with my duties under Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I conclude that the development would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the HCA. It conflicts with Policies HP2 and HP3 of the Harrogate District Local Plan and with Section 16 of the Framework, which require high quality design that conserves and enhances the historic environment and respects local character and distinctiveness.

Other Matters

12. Concerns raised by third parties regarding parking, privacy, and outlook have been noted. However, these were not part of the Council's refusal, and as the appeal is being dismissed on other substantive planning grounds, are not determinative in this appeal.
13. Allegations of unauthorised works at the site are not material to this decision and have not influenced the outcome.

Heritage and Planning Balance

14. It is not in dispute that the Council has a significant shortfall in housing land supply, currently measured at 2.8 years. In such circumstances, paragraph 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is engaged.
15. The proposal would deliver a single 1-bedroom dwelling in an accessible, town-centre location, also contributing to a specific need for smaller homes in the area. As a small scheme, it could be delivered quickly. These are positive factors that weigh in favour of the proposal.
16. However, the scale of public benefits from a single dwelling is modest, and even taking account of the current housing land supply position, is not sufficient to outweigh the identified heritage harm. In accordance with paragraph 11(d)(i) of the Framework, the policies that protect heritage assets provide a strong reason for

refusing the proposal. As such, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply.

17. While the design of the dwelling may align with some general principles of good design set out in Section 12 of the Framework, this does not override the specific heritage concerns in this case.

Conclusion

18. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and with national heritage protection policies. There are no other considerations, including housing delivery, that outweigh this conflict. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR