
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2021

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/21/3285001

51 Grangefield Avenue, Burley in Wharfedale, Ilkley LS29 7HA

- 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 Simon Selvon against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02894/HOU, dated 26 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 26 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is replacement of existing dormer to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for replacement of existing dormer to front elevation at 51 Grangefield Avenue, Burley in Wharfedale, Ilkley LS29 7HA in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/02894/HOU dated 26 May 2021 and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the proposal has altered from the application form to the decision notice. That on the application form adequately describes the proposal and I have determined the appeal on this basis.
3. I noted on my site visit that a dormer window was present on the front roof slope of the property. This appeared to broadly accord with the submitted plans. I have determined the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans for the avoidance of doubt.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Burley in Wharfedale Conservation Area (the Conservation Area).

Reasons

5. The appeal property forms part of an established and attractive terrace of residential properties. The layout, materials, form and rhythmic and repeated openings on the front elevation of this terrace and that opposite are among the defining features of the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area.
6. However, the front roof slopes have been widely altered along both terraces as a result of the extensive provision of box style dormer windows.

7. These themselves widely differ in their appearance, being of varying widths, set backs from the eaves and window arrangements. The materials, colour, and extent of cladding both to the dormer cheeks and fronts also varies widely.
8. Within this context, the dormer window, which is clad in dark materials to match the dark slate roof and which is set in from the sides of the roof, up from the eaves and down from the ridgeline does not form a feature which is out of character with the terraces within the street.
9. I appreciate that the dormer window conflicts with some of the SPD¹ guidance including in relation to its use of cladding and with regard to its width.
10. However, the street specific circumstances, to which I have afforded significant weight, along with the design of the dormer window mean that it is acceptable in terms of its Conservation Area location.
11. The dormer window does not detract from the heritage significance of the Conservation Area which sits in part with the layout, materials, form and rhythmic and repeated openings on the front elevations of the terraces as opposed to the much-altered front roof slopes. The dormer window therefore preserves the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
12. Subsequently, the proposal accords with Policies DS1, DS3 and EN3 of the Core Strategy (2017) and Policy BW1 of the Burley in Wharfedale Post-Examination Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan 2017 - 2030 which amongst other things require good design that is appropriate to local character and which protects heritage assets.

Conditions

13. Conditions suggested by the Council relating to a time limit for commencement, materials and approved plans would not be necessary given the appeal development appears to be completed.

Conclusion

14. I have identified no conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations to indicate that the appeal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR

¹ Local Development Framework for Bradford – Householder Supplementary Planning Document.