
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 October 2016

by David Cross BA (Hons), PGDip, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/16/3147433

Ravenswood, 62 Chevin Avenue, Menston, Ilkley LS29 6PE

- 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 Ms C Senior against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 15/03489/FUL, dated 11 August 2015, was refused by notice dated 16 October 2015.
 - The development proposed is replacement dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for replacement dwelling at Ravenswood, 62 Chevin Avenue, Menston, Ilkley LS29 6PE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 15/03489/FUL, dated 11 August 2015, 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: Drg No 200 Proposed Floor Layout; Drg No 201 Typical Sections; Drg No 202 Site Plan; Drg No 203 Elevations; Site Location plan dated Aug 2015.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the dwelling hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site consists of a hipped roof detached bungalow located centrally in a substantial garden plot and set back from the road. It is located on a private residential estate which consists of dwellings of varying design similarly located in substantial plots and which has an attractive leafy character
-

4. The proposal consists of replacing the bungalow with a flat roofed single storey dwelling extending along the northern boundary of the site. In comparison to the existing bungalow, the proposed dwelling would project closer to the road and would be set back from the edge of the kerb by approximately 6 metres.
5. The Council state that the proposal would contrast with the established building pattern on the estate, where dwellings are set well back from the road to provide a spacious character to the area. They also refer to the general alignment of properties along Chevin Avenue. However, it was apparent at my site visit that, in comparison to other streets on the estate, the building line along Chevin Avenue is not as well defined or readily apparent. Furthermore, although the proposal would be located closer to the highway than the existing bungalow, the limited height of the flat roofed dwelling would reduce its impact on views along the street. The dwelling would also be seen within the context of the garage of the adjacent property of 63 Chevin Avenue which is also located in relatively close proximity to the highway.
6. Although the footprint of the dwelling would be larger than that of the bungalow it would replace, it would still be set within a generous garden area and would not detract from the spacious appearance of the estate. The appeal site is screened by a high hedge which would further reduce any impact arising from the extent and location of the dwelling. However, even if the hedge was reduced in height or removed, I consider that the dwelling would not appear as an incongruous feature within the street scene due to its limited height and being viewed within the context of the adjacent garage of No 63.
7. The proposed dwelling would be of a modern appearance and I note that the Council state that the design has merit. I am also mindful that a Management Committee which oversees development proposals on this private estate has written in support of the proposal.
8. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore not conflict with saved Policies D1 and UR3 of the Council's Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2005 which state that development should be of a high quality design and layout that is well related to the existing character of the locality and should not have an adverse effect on the surrounding environment. These Policies are broadly consistent with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework with respect to requiring good design.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed. In addition to the standard 3 year time limitation for commencement, I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans. A condition relating to external materials is also necessary to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the dwelling.

David Cross

INSPECTOR