

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 May 2017

by Siobhan Watson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 1 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/17/3174068

83 Cross Lane, Tong, Bradford, BD11 2BY

- 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 Jemma Waite against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/09587/HOU, dated 30 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension / single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension / single storey rear extension at 83 Cross Lane, Tong, Bradford, BD11 2BY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/09587/HOU, dated 30 November 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 16/160 -A101 & -A102A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and street-scene.

Reasons

3. The dwelling is situated at the end of a row of similar semi-detached houses, with the exception of a bungalow which sits amongst them. The side extension would be two-storey with a single storey element projecting to the rear.
 4. I appreciate that the extension would be more than 2/3 of the width of the original dwellinghouse and that this would be contrary to the advice in the Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document. However, the objective of this advice is to ensure that extensions look acceptable and are subservient to the main house.
 5. In this particular case, the extension would be set a long way back from the principal front elevation of the house and its roof would be significantly lower
-

than the ridge of the main roof. These two factors would ensure that the extension would appear subservient to the original building. The original pair of dwellings would remain visually dominant over the extension; and the symmetry of the pair would be retained. Therefore, the architectural balance of the existing pair of dwellings would remain.

6. I conclude that the proposed extension would not harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the street-scene. Consequently, I find no conflict with Policies D1 and UR3 of the Bradford Replacement Unitary Development Plan which seek to ensure that new development is of a high quality design and does not have an adverse effect upon the surrounding environment.

Conditions

7. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard implementation condition it is necessary, in the interests of precision, to define the plans with which the scheme should accord. A condition in respect of materials is necessary in the interests of visual amenity.

Conclusion

8. For the above reasons, I allow the appeal subject to the conditions.

Siobhan Watson

INSPECTOR