

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 February 2021

by C McDonagh BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/20/3263020

21 Wild Heather Close, Cullingworth, Bingley BD13 5ET

- 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 Singh against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/03434/HOU, dated 7 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 13 October 2020.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of the existing detached garage with ancillary home office accommodation above.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and street scene, and on the living conditions of occupiers of No.23 Wild Heather Close with regard to overshadowing and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, detached dwelling which is one of three aligned at the head of a cul-de-sac. The appeal property and No.17 are set to either side of the middle property (No.19) and both have garages to the front set at 90° to their respective host buildings. Wild Heather Close includes a mix of detached, semi-detached and terraced houses and slopes downhill from its junction with Haworth Road.
4. The Householder Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD) advises the size, position and form of extensions, dormer windows and outbuildings should maintain or improve the character and quality of the original house and wider area. It also states if a garage is attached to a house or occupies a prominent location, it should be treated the same way as a house extension.
5. Despite the attempts made to reduce the overall scale of the proposed garage and improve its design through amended plans, the proposal would be of significantly increased height over that of the existing garage, with its apex positioned above the eaves of the dwelling. The width and length of the proposal would result in a that would erode the ancillary relationship between the two buildings. This would be compounded by the prominent, elevated

position of the proposed garage, adding significant mass of built development to the front of the property.

6. Moreover, while the Close as a whole has a somewhat irregular pattern of development, the two garages to the front of No's 17 and 21 add an element of symmetry which contributes positively to the character of the street scene. The proposal would remove this symmetry by introducing a structure which is of significantly increased scale and incongruous appearance. Accordingly, the development would not appear visually harmonious both in context with the host property and the street scene.
7. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host property and street scene. Consequently, it fails to comply with the requirements of Policies SC9, DS1 and DS3 of the Bradford District Core Strategy Development Plan Document (the CS), which seek to ensure design is informed by a good understanding of the site/area and its context. The proposal would also be contrary to guidance contained in the SPD, which advises the size, position and form of outbuildings should maintain or improve the character and quality of the original house and wider area.

Living conditions of occupiers of No.23 Wild Heather Close

8. The side elevation of the proposed garage would be located close to the side elevation of No.23. The existing garage is currently visible from the rear garden of No.23 and an existing lean-to car port which sits between the garage and the boundary of No.23 would be removed.
9. The SPD advises garages should not have an overbearing impact on any neighbour or significantly reduce the daylight reaching their habitable rooms or well used part of their garden. In many cases, extensions and outbuildings that have an overbearing impact upon their neighbours' will also cause an unacceptable loss of light to neighbouring properties and their gardens.
10. While views from rear windows of No.23 at ground level would likely be at an oblique angle, the increased height and length of the proposed garage would nevertheless introduce an overbearing and visually dominant feature in views from their outdoor amenity space. Despite the roof pitch sloping away, this feature would reduce outlook and create a feeling of enclosure within the rear garden which would diminish the enjoyment of this space. The dominating presence of the proposal would therefore detract from the quality of the living environment for occupiers of this property.
11. Furthermore, given the proximity, height and location of the proposed garage relative to the rear garden of No.23, there would be overshadowing of the rear amenity space of this property. This would harm the living conditions of occupiers of this property.
12. Consequently, I find that the proposal would harm the living conditions of occupiers of No.23 Wild Heather Close with regard to outlook and overshadowing. As such, it fails to comply with the requirements of Policy DS5 of the CS, which seek to ensure development does not harm the amenity of existing and prospective users and residents. The proposal would also be contrary to guidance contained within the SPD, which advises garages should not have an overbearing impact on any neighbour or significantly reduce the daylight reaching their habitable rooms or well used part of their garden.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above the appeal is dismissed.

C McDonagh

INSPECTOR