

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 May 2017

by Caroline Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17th May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/17/3169627

17 Westlea Avenue, Riddlesden, Keighley, West Yorkshire BD20 5EJ

- 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 S Ali against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/08818/HOU, dated 3 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is change of roof from hip to gable and front and rear dormer windows.
-

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 host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey end of terrace with a hipped roof. The property is situated within a cul-de-sac of semi-detached and terraced properties of a similar character all with hipped roofs. The terraced row of three houses displays a strong sense of rhythm and symmetry which is replicated in the surrounding blocks of terraced properties. This replication has a positive effect on the character and appearance of the area.
 4. The erection of a gable extension would appear at odds with the balanced and symmetrical appearance of the row of properties resulting in an incongruous addition which would upset the rhythm of the terrace. The gable roof would also be at odds with the surrounding dwellings, all of which have hipped roofs. The result would be a visually jarring development that would have an unduly harmful effect on both the host property and the street scene.
 5. Given the set in of the proposed rear dormer from the side of the roof and the limited views of the rear of the property, I do not consider that this element of the scheme would materially harm the character and appearance of the dwelling. Nevertheless, this does not outweigh my concerns above in relation to the gable extension.
-

6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area and find conflict with Policies D1 and UR3 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan for Bradford District (2005). These seek to ensure, amongst other things, that development is well related to the existing character of the locality in terms of design, scale, massing height and materials and does not have an adverse effect on the surrounding environment. The proposal also conflicts with guidance in the Householder Supplementary Planning Document (2012) which states that the form and roof type of an extension should normally match or closely relate to the original building.

Other Matters

7. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of applications which he states have been approved for similar developments. However, I do not have the full details of the circumstances that led to these proposals being accepted and so cannot be sure they represent a direct parallel to the appeal proposal. In any case I have determined the appeal on its own merits.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Caroline Jones

INSPECTOR