

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16th September 2016

by Alison Roland BSc DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 23 September 2016

Appeal Ref: W4705/D/16/3151972

17 Ascot Parade, Bradford, BD7 4NJ.

- 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 G Mustafa against the decision of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref: 16/02251/HOU, dated 22 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is extension, alterations and conversion of garage.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The address of the appeal site on the planning application form differs from that cited in the header above. The appellant confirmed that this was in error and I have adopted the correct address therefore, in the header above.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for extension, alterations and conversion of garage, at 17 Ascot Parade, Bradford, BD7 4NU, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 16/02251/HOU, dated 22 March 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Existing Plans and Elevations: Drawing No 100 dated Feb 2016; Proposed Plans and Elevations: Drawing No 200C dated Feb 2016.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details / samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details / samples.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are the implications of the proposal for (1) the character and appearance of the area and (2) the living conditions of occupiers
-

of No 19 Ascot Parade, by virtue of the potential for overbearing effects and loss of light and outlook.

Reasons

4. The proposed extension would be part two storey and part single storey. The latter element would extend up to the side boundary, with the two storey element set in around 1 metre therefrom. The front face of the extension would be set back around 1 metre from the front face of the existing dwelling, which is a semi detached dormer bungalow.
5. The Council assert that the extension would give rise to a terracing effect, but I cannot agree for several reasons. Firstly, the aforementioned set backs from the side and front boundaries would ensure that it would read as an obvious and subordinate addition to the side of the property. The reduced ridge line relative to the ridge of the existing bungalow would assist in this effect. Coupled with the further step down from the two storey to the single storey element, (the latter standing closest to the boundary), the resultant bulk and massing of the dwelling would appear to respect the side boundary. The Council suggest that the single storey element should be set back further in accordance with advice in the Local Development Framework *Householder* Supplementary Planning Document (April 2012), (SPD), but as it would stand behind the front face of the existing dwelling, I see no conflict therewith.
6. Finally, as Ascot Parade stands on a slope, the adjoining pair of semi detached properties stands at an appreciably higher level. This would reduce the potential for any terracing effect, even if the occupier of No 15 chose to erect a side extension of some kind.
7. The extension to the width of the dormer on the front of the property would result in it being appreciably wider than that on the adjoining dwelling. However, I noted other pairs of semis in the immediate vicinity which similarly exhibit some asymmetry in their dormers, including both pairs of semis to the immediate South of the appeal property. Moreover, the increased width of the dormer (which would be similar to that on No 15 adjacent), would simply reflect the increased width and massing of the appeal property and would appear entirely in scale and keeping with it. In these circumstances, I cannot accept that it would appear as a discordant feature.
8. In terms of living conditions, the Council's concern rests with the squaring off of the single storey extension to the rear of the property. However in reality, this would result in a negligible addition to the rear extension in terms of its bulk. Given its single storey flat roofed nature and the fact that it would project only slightly beyond a single storey rear addition to No 19, I cannot accept that it would have any appreciable effect on that property by virtue of overbearing effects or loss of light or outlook.
9. Overall, I find that the extension would be acceptable in terms of both the main issues identified. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policies UR3 and D1 of the City of Bradford Replacement Unitary Development Plan (October 2005), together with the advice in the SPD, which seek to ensure that development is of a high standard of design, well related to the existing character of the locality and does not have an adverse effect on the occupants of adjoining land.

10. The Council suggest a matching materials condition which is necessary to secure a satisfactory finish. However, as not all materials are specified, I shall instead require details of materials to be agreed with the Council.

ALISON ROLAND

INSPECTOR