



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 November 2022

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/22/3305459

10 Hollingwood Park, Ilkley LS29 9NZ

- 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 Mark Templeman against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02179/HOU, dated 16 May 2022, was refused by notice dated 11 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as: 'Replace rear of garage with larger single-storey extension. Convert half garage space in to a habitable room. Small central two-storey extension above. Replace second storey rear Velux window with a small dormer window to match existing.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed in so far as it relates to 'replace rear of garage with larger single-storey extension. Convert half garage space in to a habitable room. Small central two-storey extension above'.
2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted in so far as it relates to the replacement of second storey rear Velux window with a dormer window to match existing, at 10 Hollingwood Park, Ilkley LS29 9NZ, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 22/02179/HOU, dated 16 May 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted: location plan; proposed plans and elevations 03 Rev B; proposed site plan 04 Rev B.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the dormer window hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the host building and its surroundings; and
 - Parking provision.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Hollingwood Park is a compact town house development arranged around a short cul-de-sac. The buildings are similarly constructed in a traditional style and materials. This gives the development as a whole a high degree of visual cohesiveness and adds positively to local distinctiveness.
5. The Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (SPD) recognises that whilst rear extensions will not normally have a major impact on the quality of the street scene, it is nevertheless still important to achieve a good standard of design. Amongst various design principles, it requires extensions to complement the design of the original property, including in respect of the layout, proportions, and design of windows. It further advises that if a building has a well-balanced pattern of openings, the addition of too many windows, which are poorly aligned and of various sizes, will cause disruption and harm the look of a building.
6. Whilst the rear ground floor extension would not be objectionable in and of itself, the first floor element above it would be a very awkward and uncharacteristic high-level addition, notwithstanding its size and the use of matching materials. It's siting, proportions, and the horizontal band of windows would be entirely at odds with the simple character and the solid-to-void ratio found across the upper floors at the rear of this group of houses. The result would be an addition which does not integrate sensitively with the character and appearance of the host building and disrupts the strong visual cohesiveness of this development of town houses as a whole.
7. For these reasons, there would be unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host building and its immediate surroundings. In this regard, the proposal conflicts with the design requirements of Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2017 (CS); and the SPD. Similarly, there is conflict with the design requirements of Policy INDP5 of the Ilkley Neighbourhood Development Plan 2020-2030.
8. However, the change from a Velux window to a dormer window at the rear did not feature in the Council's refusal reasons and I am satisfied that the new dormer would not result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the building and its surroundings. As this element is functionally and physically separate from the other elements of the proposals a split decision can be made to allow the dormer window only.

Parking

9. The proposals also seek to convert part of the integral garage to additional living accommodation, and in doing so, it would make the remaining part of the garage unsuitable for vehicle parking. Notwithstanding this, the appellant states that the parking situation will remain unchanged as the garage is deemed, by them, as 'dead space'.
10. I acknowledge that garages are not always used by owners for car parking. However, there is little before me which demonstrates that this garage is of a substandard size that would render its use for parking impractical. Indeed, during my site visit I observed a neighbouring resident pulling a car out of their similar garage. Thus, it seems to me that the appellant's use of the garage for

other purposes is a matter of personal choice, but circumstances and ownership can change and the proposal would permanently remove that choice for any future occupants.

11. Accordingly, the proposal would leave this family-sized dwelling with just one dedicated off-street parking space in front of the garage. Due to the tight layout and access arrangements within this small cul-de-sac estate, there are very few, if any, opportunities to accommodate displaced parking without being obstructive and causing inconvenience to other residents and road users.
12. I have also had regard to the Council's concern over setting a precedent for similar development in this estate. I consider that this is not a generalised fear of precedent, but a realistic and specific concern given the similarities in parking arrangements at the other town houses. Whilst I am mindful that each application and appeal must be treated on its individual merits, allowing this appeal would make it more difficult to resist further planning applications for similar proposals within the estate, and I consider that their cumulative effect would exacerbate the harm that I have identified.
13. I therefore find that the proposal would lead to an unacceptable reduction in parking provision at the property with the potential to cause obstruction and inconvenience to other residents and road users in this estate. This conflicts with the design-led approach to parking provision in CS Policies DS4 and TR2. The loss of off-street parking is also contrary to the SPD.

Other Matters

14. The proposals would benefit the occupants of the appeal property with improved living space. Even so, this is not justification for the harm that would be caused.

Conditions

15. In relation to the dormer window, the standard commencement and approved plans conditions are imposed for certainty. A further condition requiring its external materials to match the existing building is necessary in the interests of visual amenity.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed in relation to the dormer window, but should be dismissed in relation to the rear extensions and garage conversion. A split decision is therefore issued.

A Caines

INSPECTOR