
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2016

by Jason Whitfield BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22nd December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/16/3161595

22 Glenrose Drive, Bradford BD7 2QQ

- 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 Sehra Ali against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/06324/HOU, dated 27 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is construction of two storey extension.
-

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 area.
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of 24 Glenrose Drive with particular regard to privacy.
 - The effect of the proposed parking arrangements on highway safety.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, detached dwelling located on Glenrose Drive. Located within a predominately residential area, Glenrose Drive is largely characterised by two-storey detached and semi-detached housing. The detached properties along this part of Glenrose Drive are relatively modest in both scale and architectural merit. Properties are set back from the road with large gaps between, resulting in an area of open and spacious character.
 4. The appeal site is separated from the adjacent property 24 Glenrose Drive by a public footpath which leads to a parking area on Glenbrook Drive. To that end the spacing between the two properties is greater than that typically found within the street scene. Furthermore, the property is bound on three sides by a low boundary wall which exposes the entirety of its built form. The topography of the area slopes down from the property towards Glenbrook Drive. As a result, the appeal property is visible from several vantage points within Glenrose Drive and Glenbrook Drive.
-

5. It is proposed to erect a two storey extension to the side and rear of the property. The extension would be set back around 1m from the front elevation of the property, in line with the guidance set out in Section 2 of the Council's Householder SPD¹. However, the SPD also states that the original house should be dominant and extensions should appear as sympathetic additions. It goes on to state that a well-designed subordinate extension will help maintain the original appearance of the house and the wider area.
6. The proposed extension would extend around 3.4m to the side and would directly abut the public footpath. It would extend a considerable proportion of the overall depth of the appeal site, with a length far in excess of the existing dwelling. Moreover, part of the extension would have a ridge height matching that of the main house, whilst the remainder would only be marginally below the main roof. Furthermore, the extension would have a similar eaves height to the main property. Consequently, the proposal would fail to appear subordinate to the original property and would result in a prominent addition that would be a dominant and incongruous feature within the street scene.
7. I note that the houses on Glenrose Drive have limited architectural appeal and are mainly of a box type construction. However, for the reasons above I cannot agree that the proposal would be an improvement to the overall street scene nor would it add a visual enhancement to the area.
8. I conclude, therefore, that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Thus, it would conflict with Saved Policies UR3 and D1 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan for the Bradford District 2005 (RUDP) which state that development should be well related to the existing character of the locality and should not have an adverse effect on the surrounding environment.

Living Conditions

9. The proposed extension would project around 6m beyond the rear of the dwelling and would abut the verge of the adjacent public footpath. The side elevation of the extension would face the flank wall of the neighbouring property, 24 Glenrose Drive. It would contain several windows, some of which would serve bedrooms, a kitchen and a dining room. There are no windows in the flank wall of No 24. The proposal would not therefore result in any loss of privacy for neighbouring occupiers within the property itself.
10. Nonetheless, the extension and the windows therein would also face the rear garden of No 24. The Council has raised concerns that this would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy for the neighbours. However, there is a public footpath around 3.5m in width between the two. Moreover, the rear garden of No 24 is bound by a 1.8m high close boarded fence as well as a dense cover of high, mature trees. Consequently, any views of the rear garden from the habitable rooms of the proposed extension would be limited.
11. I conclude, therefore, that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 24 Glenrose Drive with particular regard to privacy. The proposal would therefore accord with Saved Policies UR3 and D1 of the RUDP in so far as they state that development must not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents or the occupants of adjoining land.

¹ Local Development Framework for Bradford Householder Supplementary Planning Document 2012

Highway Safety

12. The appeal property has a detached garage which is located to the rear of the site. It is accessed via a driveway to the side of the property. The proposal would result in the loss of the garage and a significant proportion of the existing driveway. The Council has indicated that the proposal would result in a 5 bedroom property with only 1 off-street parking space.
13. However, the appellant has indicated that the remaining driveway would be capable of accommodating 2 cars. Whilst I have only limited detail of how 2 vehicles would be accommodated on the remaining drive, in the absence of any contrary evidence from the Council, I see no reason to disagree with the appellant.
14. Whilst the existing parking provision would likely accommodate more than 2 vehicles, there is no evidence to suggest the reduction in spaces proposed would result in an inadequate provision for a 5 bedroom house. The Council has not made reference to any adopted parking standards. In any event, Glenrose Drive is a minor residential road which does not provide a through route and consequently, carries limited levels of traffic travelling at relatively low speeds. Moreover, it is already subject to some on-street parking. As a result, on the evidence before me, I am satisfied that the proposal would be unlikely to result in an increase in on-street parking to a degree which would be harmful to the safe and free flow of traffic.
15. I conclude, therefore, that the proposed parking arrangements would be unlikely to have a harmful effect on highway safety. Consequently, the proposal would accord with Saved Policy TM19A of the RUDP which relates to the potential impact on traffic management and road safety.

Other Matters

16. The appellant indicates that the original application was not processed following the correct procedures and that there had been no communication from the planning department. However, I have no substantive evidence to support such comments and therefore afford them little weight.

Conclusions

17. Whilst I have found that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on highway safety or the living conditions of the occupiers of 24 Glenrose Drive with particular regard to privacy, I have found the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. That is the prevailing consideration and thus, the proposal would conflict with Policies UR3 and D1 of the UDRP. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jason Whitfield

INSPECTOR