The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2019

by R E Walker BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/19/3229195
17 Longwood View, Crossflatts, Bingley, Bradford BD16 2RZ

- 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 Emma Cochrane against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
- The application Ref 18/04970/FUL, dated 9 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 15 January 2019.
- The development proposed was originally described as new rear two storey, lift roof and split building for two new dwellings, car parking and access.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of the development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. This describes the development as a 'new two storey rear extension, roof alterations and conversion of building to create one additional dwelling, car parking and access'. This is the description used by the Council on the decision notice. I consider this to be a more accurate description of the appeal proposal and I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:

   - the character and appearance of the area; and
   - the living conditions of the occupants of No 16 Longwood View having particular regard to outlook and the living conditions of the occupants of the proposed development having particular regard to outdoor amenity space provision.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is a detached dormer bungalow located near the end of a cul-de-sac containing a mixture of two storey terrace houses and dormer bungalows. The appeal property is positioned in between 2 other dormer

bungalows which step down in height sequentially to the end property (No 16 Longwood View) where the cul-de-sac terminates adjacent to a field.

5. The proposal would increase the scale and massing of the appeal building which would be evident from public views. This would present a full two storey gable to the street which would contrast with the 2 neighbouring properties either side. The appellant advises that the resulting height of the proposed development would be no taller than No 18 Longwood View. Even if the ridgelines were the same height, the overall scale and massing of the proposal would still appear significantly greater than the neighbouring properties due to the increased eaves height.

6. The overall scale and massing of the proposal would disrupt the harmony and rhythm of the houses on this side of the road as they step down to the field. The change in ground level between the appeal site and No 16 Longwood View would emphasise this further. I appreciate that the wider area is characterised by a variety of house styles and sizes. However, it is the resulting relationship of the proposed development within the immediate street scene which leads me to conclude that the proposal would appear as a discordant feature. This ultimately would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area.

7. I have been referred to several other developments where larger buildings have been approved by the Council on streets containing bungalows. Whilst some plans and photographs have been provided the full details that led to those proposals being accepted are not before me and I am not satisfied that the circumstances are directly comparable to the case before me. In any event, I am required to consider the proposal on its own merits and my concerns relate not to the principle of redeveloping the existing property but to the specific relationship of the resulting development within the street scene in this specific context.

8. On the first main issue, I therefore conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such the proposal would conflict with Policy DS1 (Achieving Good Design) and Policy DS3 (Urban Character) of the Local Plan for the Bradford District Core Strategy Development Plan Document Adopted July 2017 (CS) which are concerned with the character and appearance of developments.

Living Conditions

9. The proposed development would result in a larger building than currently exists which would be evident from the neighbouring property (No 16). This property has a dormer window, set back from the eaves, on its side roof slope facing the appeal property. There would be a change in outlook from this window. However, a separation gap would remain due to the driveway on the appeal site and the position of No 16's garage and dormer window. The combination of those factors would, in my view, ensure that the proposal would not appear overbearing or oppressive from the neighbour's dormer window.

10. I accept that from the rear garden of No 16 the proposal would appear greater in scale than the existing dwelling. However, the neighbouring property is positioned beyond the rear building line of the existing appeal dwelling. The proposal seeks to remove the existing garage, adjacent to the rear boundary. This would reduce a sense of enclosure from within the rear garden of No 16.

When these factors are combined with the length of the proposed extension, I do not consider that the resulting increased scale and massing of the building, would appear overbearing or oppressive from the garden of the neighbouring property.

11. At present No 17 is served by a garden of ample size. A private amenity space is proposed to the rear and partially along the side of the two proposed dwellings. Although smaller than currently exists, the appellant's have demonstrated that space can still be provided for car parking and bin storage as well as garden areas. This resulting amenity space would still provide a reasonable and useable private area for each dwelling. It would, in my view, be of a suitable quality and usability to serve the needs of future occupants of the proposed dwellings.

12. On the second main issue, I conclude that the proposal would not result in an adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupants of No 16 Longwood View. Furthermore, appropriate outdoor amenity space would be provided for future occupants of the proposed development. As such the proposal would accord with the requirements of Policy DS5 (Safe and Inclusive Places) of the CS which seeks, amongst other things, to ensure a good standard of living conditions for existing and future occupiers of land and buildings.

Other Matters

13. I recognise that the appeal property is in a sustainable location and that the proposed development would be of benefit to the local housing market in providing additional family housing. However local and national planning policy would expect housing to be located sustainably and that is not a matter that attracts substantial weight over and above what would normally be expected. Moreover, a net gain of a single dwelling would only have a limited impact in the context of the overall housing supply, and I attach limited weight to the benefit in that regard.

Conclusion

14. The proposal would not harm the living conditions of the occupants of No 16 Longwood View, would provide appropriate levels of outdoor amenity space, would be located in a sustainable location, and would contribute to the local supply of housing. However, the lack of harm in those respects and the limited benefit I afford to an additional residential unit does not outweigh the significant harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the area. For this reason, and having had regard to all matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Robert Walker

INSPECTOR