
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2016

by C L Humphrey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 25th November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/D/16/3158096

74 Tyersal Crescent, Tyersal, Bradford BD4 8HA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr John Ward against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref 16/02628/FU, dated 25 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is a roof height increase and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a roof height increase and loft conversion at 74 Tyersal Crescent, Tyersal, Bradford BD4 8HA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/02628/FU, dated 25 April 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Block/Site/Location Plan	
Existing Plans/Elevations	Drawing No. 7897/01
Proposed Plans/Elevations	Drawing No. 7897/02
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a bungalow located in a crescent of residential properties which vary considerably in terms of their scale, form, materials and relationship to the street.
 4. Immediately to the west of the appeal property are two other bungalows at 76 and 78 Tyersal Crescent. The appeal property is a handed version of the other two bungalows, so the pattern of fenestration on the front elevation is
-

different. The detailed design of the windows and doors of the three bungalows also varies, and their appearance has been further altered by the addition of a porch to No 78 and a small canopy above the front door of the appeal property.

5. The three bungalows are positioned in a staggered arrangement, with gable ends facing Tyersal Crescent. Ground levels fall away slightly to the north and so the appeal property, which is set further back than the others and at a different angle, is lower than Nos 76 and 78 when viewed from the street.
6. The appeal proposal would raise the height of the eaves and ridge in order to accommodate bedrooms within the roof space, and a window would be inserted in both the front and rear gable end at first floor level. The proposed development would be modest in scale, the detailing and materials would respect the original bungalow and the resultant form of the appeal property would reflect that of neighbouring bungalows and nearby dormer bungalows. Although the appeal property is situated in a fairly prominent location at the northern end of the crescent, due to the variety of built form in the street and the differences in the siting and detailed design of Nos 74, 76 and 78, the appeal proposal would not result in an incongruous form of development.
7. Taking the above matters into consideration, I conclude that the proposed development would not have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. The appeal proposal therefore accords with the design aims of Policy P10 of the Leeds Core Strategy, Policies GP5 and BD6 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan and Policy HDG1 of the Leeds Householder Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, and with the core planning principles and policy aims in respect of design set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

8. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. In order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development, I have imposed a condition relating to materials.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

C L Humphrey

INSPECTOR