

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2019

**by Sarah Manchester BSc MSc PhD MEnvSc**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 25<sup>th</sup> September 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/19/3231791**

**50 Lawn Avenue, Burley in Wharfedale, Ilkley LS29 7ET**

- 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 Gareth Lloyd against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
  - The application Ref 19/01378/HOU, dated 22 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 22 May 2019.
  - The development proposed is a part two and single storey side extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matter

2. The development was described in the application form as 'two storey side extension'. However, the single storey part has a larger footprint than the first floor part and I have therefore adopted the description in the banner heading above from the decision notice as this is a more accurate description of the appeal proposal.
3. The Council's second reason for refusal relates to the submission of insufficient information in respect of the proposed boundary treatment to enable a full assessment of the effect of the proposal. The appellant has submitted revised plans with the appeal which include details of the boundary treatment and which propose additional amendments, including in terms of materials. However, the revised plans are not the plans that were considered by the Council or upon which interested people's views were sought. Therefore, I cannot be certain that interested parties would not be prejudiced if I was to accept the amended scheme. Accordingly, I have determined the appeal based on the plans that were considered by the Council.

### Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

### Reasons

5. No 50 is a 2 storey semi-detached property occupying a triangular plot in a prominent corner location at the junction of Lawn Avenue and Langford Lane. It is part of a group of similar properties constructed in stone and brick with concrete tile roofs and with repeating decorative detailing to front elevations.

Properties are set back from the street behind open front gardens with low walls. Notwithstanding that some of the properties have been extended previously, there is nevertheless a consistent and harmonious character and appearance to this part of the street.

6. The pitched roof first floor part of the proposal would appear similar in size and scale to the first floor side extensions of nearby properties. However, by virtue of its significantly larger footprint and its rotation through approximately 45 degrees, the ground floor part would be offset from, and it would extend beyond, the first floor. The resulting flat roofed triangular projections to the front, rear and side elevations would have an awkward relationship with, and they would not relate well to, the building lines and form of the host property or the first floor extension.
7. While dwellings in the area are constructed from a mix of materials, the proposed use of render would not match or complement the host property or the group, contrary to the guidance in the Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document Adopted April 2012. The proposed render finish would not therefore be appropriate to the surrounding context. It would increase the visual impact of the proposal and it would detract from the consistency of this part of the street scene. While I am mindful that the appellant has sought to amend the materials through the appeal process, for the reasons explained above I have made my assessment based on the scheme that was considered by the Council.
8. By virtue of its size, scale and design, and considered as a whole, the proposed extension would be an overly large and bulky addition and it would not appear subservient to the host property. It would not relate well to the adjoining property and it would not balance the pair of semi-detached properties. It would be markedly dissimilar and incongruous in the context of the group of which it forms part. Consequently, it would be a discordant feature that would not respect the appearance of the original property and it would disrupt the coherent streetscape.
9. The Council considers that there are insufficient details of the proposed boundary treatment to allow a full assessment of the impact of the proposal. In this respect, and although the application form states that no hedgerows would be removed, the plans that were before the Council appear to indicate that the roadside hedge would be removed and replaced by a tall boundary fence. In the absence of clarity, the proposals do not demonstrate that the boundary treatment would be sympathetic to the local context and reinforce the character of the area.
10. My attention has been drawn to properties elsewhere with flat roof single storey extensions and car ports. Full details of those schemes are not before me. However, the example on Lawn Avenue is a small and subservient feature. The properties on Langford Lane appear to be substantial detached dwellings and the low side extensions and distinctive front elevations appear to be characteristic features of the properties and the street scene. They do not appear to be directly comparable to the appeal scheme before me and neither they nor car ports elsewhere in the area provide a justification for the proposal.
11. Therefore the proposed extension would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would conflict with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Local Plan for Bradford District Core Strategy

Development Plan Document Adopted July 2017 and Policy BW01 of the Burley in Wharfedale Post-Examination Draft Neighbourhood Plan 2017-2030 Adopted May 2018. These require, among other things, that development contributes to high quality places and reinforces local character, being appropriate to its surroundings including in terms of layout, scale, details and materials.

### **Other Matters**

12. I appreciate that the proposal would create additional internal living accommodation and a new external amenity space to the front and side of the property. However, there is little before me to demonstrate that the existing property is not suitable to be occupied by a family or that similar benefits could not be achieved by alternative proposals that would not conflict with the development plan.

### **Conclusion**

13. For the above reasons, the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

*Sarah Manchester*

INSPECTOR