
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 August 2019

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary

Decision date: 30 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/19/3230112

1 Derry Lane, Menston, Ilkley LS29 6NQ

- 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 Hird against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01229/FUL, dated 13 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a bungalow utilizing loft space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The site is located close to the edge of the settlement where there is a distinct transition between the urban form and a more rural character. As a result, the surrounding area has a spacious feel which contributes positively to its character and appearance. Due to the location of the site on the corner of Derry Lane and Derry Hill it occupies a prominent position within the area, with the rising topography of Derry Hill also contributing to its prominence.
4. The proposed development would be located immediately adjacent to 1 Derry Lane but would front onto Derry Hill. Whereas No 1 is a two-storey dwelling, the proposed development would be of a lesser height, comprising a bungalow with living accommodation in its roof. This difference in scale between the proposed and existing development would create a jarring visual appearance that would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. This impact would be exacerbated by the projection of the proposed development out towards Derry Hill and the fact that the land rises along Derry Hill
5. Furthermore, the absence of built form on the site contributes strongly to the spacious feel of the area and in particular to views that are taken from along Derry Hill. The addition of a dwelling to the site would introduce a cramped and incongruous feature that would cause significant harm to the spacious

character and appearance of the area and one which would be at odds with the surrounding pattern of development.

6. I conclude therefore that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area by reason of its scale and siting. Consequently, it would fail to meet with the design guidance of Policies DS1, DS3 and SC9 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2017, all of which seek to protect the character and appearance of the area.

Other Matters

7. The appellant has outlined a number of personal circumstances in support of the proposed development. I have had due regard to these matters and attach significant weight to them. However, whilst I am sympathetic to the need, they do not outweigh the degree of harm that I have identified.
8. The appellant has stated that the Council's pre-application advice was positive, however I must consider the merits of the case as I find it before me. I am therefore able to give only limited weight to any pre-application discussions that took place.
9. The proposed development would result in an additional dwelling being provided within Menston, however the contribution that it would make to the provision of new housing would be of limited benefit. This consideration does not therefore outweigh the harm to character and appearance that I have found.
10. A representation has been received which highlights the alterations that have already been made to the frontage of the existing dwelling to provide parking for both the existing dwelling and proposed development. Whilst these are noted, they do not outweigh the harm that I have found. The representation also draws attention to other developments that have taken place in Menston, however they have not changed the prevailing character in the vicinity of the site in a manner that would justify the proposed development.

Conclusion

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

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR