



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by K Allen MEng (Hons) MArch PGCert ARB RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/U2750/D/25/3372247

3 Grimbald Road, Knaresborough, North Yorkshire HG5 8HD

- 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 D Ashmore against the decision of North Yorkshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/02019/FUL.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for at 3 Grimbald Road, Knaresborough, North Yorkshire HG5 8HD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/02019/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with: Location Plan, Ashmore – 10, Ashmore – 11 rev.B and Ashmore – 12.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building/dwelling.

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 Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area; and the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupants of 1 and 5 Grimbald Road with particular regard to outlook and light.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

4. The appeal building is a two storey semi detached dwelling. The surrounding area is predominantly residential and consists of other two storey semi detached and detached properties with gardens to their fronts and rear with various alterations to different properties. This results in variation between plot sizes, layout, and differences in the gaps between properties which contributes positively to the areas character and appearance.

5. The proposed two storey side and rear extension would be read as a subservient well proportioned addition due to its modest width, set back at the front elevation and set down position from the main ridge height creating a satisfactory composition with the dwelling and its setting. The proposal would also reflect local distinctiveness in terms of its scale, proportions, and height and would be a positive addition to the variety in appearance of the houses in the vicinity.
6. Whilst the proposal would result in visual contrast between the semi-detached pair, given the variety of extensions and designs to properties within the street this in itself would not be harmful. The properties would continue to be viewed as part of a pair, although they are nevertheless also both read as separate entities given their various alterations.
7. The proposal would be built close to the boundary with No.5, resulting in a reduction in the separation distance between the properties to less than that advised by the House Extensions and Garages Design Guide (2005). However, a sufficient gap would still be maintained between the properties to prevent terracing, allowing them to still be read as distinctive, separate semi-detached pairs. Accordingly, the size and positioning of the proposed extension would maintain the generally open feeling which is characteristic of Grimbald Road.
8. Given the size of the plot within which the appeal dwelling is situated, and the maintenance of adequate separation from adjacent houses, the proposal would not comprise overdevelopment in this context.
9. I note the council's consideration of other similar schemes in the locality and elsewhere within the council's control and how these are different to the appeal scheme or predate the current adopted local plan. However, in any event I have considered the appeal scheme on its own merits and considered its site specific context as I have set out above.
10. The proposal would be in conformity with Policies HP3 and HS8 of the Harrogate District Local Plan 2014 – 2035 (March 2020) (the LP) which, amongst other things and in summary, require development to incorporate high quality building design that protects, enhances or reinforces local distinctiveness; respect the spatial qualities of the local area; respond positively to its context; and, for extensions to dwellings, ensure no adverse impact to the character or appearance of the dwelling or the surrounding area. The proposal also generally accords with the House Extension and Garage Design Guide, where it seeks to ensure sufficient separation between dwellings.

Living conditions

11. The rear elevations of No 1 and 3 Grimbald Road are angled away from that of No. 5. Each property currently benefits from an open rear outlook over their respective gardens towards mature boundary vegetation. Nos, 1,3 and 5 Grimbald Road possess predominantly west facing rear gardens.
12. The appeal scheme would extend beyond the rear elevation of the dwelling and be set away from the boundary with No.5. Due to the modest boundary fence the proposal would be visible to the neighbouring property. However, due to the orientation of the properties, angled away from one another, the extensions distance from the shared boundary, garden depth and the topography of the

properties, the extension would not be overbearing, nor would it detrimentally affect the open outlook currently afforded to the occupants of No. 5.

13. Similarly, the two-storey portion of the proposal would be generously set away from the shared boundary between the appeal dwelling and No.1. This, coupled with its modest depth would sufficiently safeguard the outlook for the occupants of No.1.
14. Both the appeal dwelling and its neighbour No.5 possess west facing rear gardens. As a result of the proposed development there would likely be some afternoon shading to the ground and first floor side windows of No.5 as well as the skylight serving the roof. This would likely be worse in the winter when the sun would be lower in the sky. However, from the information before me and my observations onsite both of these ground floor side windows were obscurely glazed and did not appear to serve habitable room windows. As a result of this and the gap between the properties and relative orientation I am not persuaded that any shading or loss of light to these windows would be to the extent that it would harm the occupants' living conditions and there is no evidence before me to suggest otherwise.
15. Turning to the skylight, this is a secondary window serving the room to the front of the house which possess a generously proportioned window to the front elevation. Therefore, I do not consider that any loss of light to the skylight as a result of the extension would be detrimental to occupants living conditions due to the windows secondary nature. The window to the first floor at No.5 appears to reflect the situation at the appeal site and is a landing window. As this is not a window serving a habitable room any loss of light is unlikely to harm the living conditions of occupants to an adverse degree.
16. Therefore, the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of the occupants of 1 and 5 Grimbald Road with particular regard to outlook and light. As such, the proposal would comply with Policy HP4 of the LP, the National Planning Policy Framework and the guidance within the House Extension and Garage Design Guide which all amongst other things seek to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring occupants.

Other matters

17. The representation suggesting the appeal scheme be reduced to a single storey extension in order to alleviate design and amenity concerns is noted. However, given that I have found no harm from the appeal scheme in regard to the main issues this is not required.

Conditions

18. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans in the interests of certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area and the host property, it is necessary to impose a planning condition requiring the use of matching materials.

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 allowed.

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 allowed.

K Allen

INSPECTOR