



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2022

by Sarah Manchester BSc MSc PhD MEnvSc

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/22/3296485

14 Cross Lane, Oxenhope, Keighley, West Yorkshire, BD22 9LE

- 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 Mrs Coe against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/06322/HOU, dated 20 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is detached private garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site was formerly occupied by a domestic garage but it is being redeveloped as a detached dwelling with hardstanding parking to the front. It is in a residential area comprising dwellings of various styles, sizes, materials and ages. Properties are set back from the street behind front boundary walls. Garages are integrated or they are set back behind front elevations to the side or, more commonly, to the rear of dwellings. The hard built environment is softened by garden planting and by the mature tree canopies and green spaces in and around the settlement.
4. The garage would be a single storey building finished in stone with a gable pitched slate roof and a timber corner door. As a result of the levelling of the site, it would be sited below the level of the road. Notwithstanding the lower ground level and the low front boundary wall, which has not yet been constructed, the garage would be prominently sited next to the footway. It would be a discordant and visually obtrusive feature that would be markedly out of keeping with the open and vegetated frontages that characterise the street scene. The siting close to the boundaries would not allow for landscape planting such as might soften or screen the garage. Consequently, the proposal would fail to contribute positively to the host dwelling or to wider sense of place and local distinctiveness.
5. My attention has been drawn to Yew Tree Lodge on the opposite side of the road, which has planning permission for a garage to the front of the dwelling. Full details have not been provided. However, that property appears to be

individually sited, set well back from the street and widely separated from its neighbours in a large plot. The garage appears to be sited forward but not directly in front of the dwelling and, by virtue of its set back and the mature landscape planting, it is relatively unobtrusive. It is not directly comparable to the appeal scheme and it does not provide a justification for it. Similarly, the mixed appearance, siting and building lines of properties in the street does not provide a justification for a conspicuous garage building next to the footway.

6. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. It would conflict with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the City of Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document Adopted July 2017. These require, among other things, that proposals are informed by a good understanding of the site and its context, and that they contribute to a strong sense of place including by responding to existing positive patterns of development that contribute to the character of the area. It would conflict with the guidance in the Householder Supplementary Planning Document Adopted April 2012. This recognises that garages can have the same visual impact as extensions, and they are not normally acceptable to the front of houses.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict.
8. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Manchester

INSPECTOR