
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2017

by Katie McDonald MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 14 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/17/3176480
6 Thurley Road, Bradford BD4 7TA

- 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 Geoff Crossley against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00634/HOU, dated 3 November 2015, was refused by notice dated 5 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and loft conversion with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and loft conversion with rear dormer at 6 Thurley Road, Bradford BD4 7TA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/00634/HOU, dated 3 November 2015, and the plans submitted with it (drawing no's GC3/01, GC3/02 and GC3/03).

Procedural Matters

2. The appeal proposal is retrospective, having been substantially completed. I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The property is a two storey semi-detached house, with a hipped roof, sited within a row of very similar two storey semi-detached dwellings. The road slopes gently down from south to north and has a residential suburban character.
5. The appeal proposal is for a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and rear dormer. The Local Planning Authority's (LPA) main concern is the lack of a 1m setback on the two storey side extension. All other elements of the scheme are considered to be acceptable, and I have considered the appeal on this basis.
6. The extension has been constructed with a gap of 1m to the side, an element that the LPA insists upon within the Local Development Framework for

Bradford, Householder Supplementary Planning Document (April 2012) (SPD) to prevent a cramped 'terracing effect'. This has the resultant impact of creating a gap between 6 and 8 Thurley Road, and reduces the overall mass of the extension, such that the terracing effect is avoided and the openness of the row is maintained. Furthermore, the existing dwelling is lower in height than the neighbouring property and the distinction between properties is quite obvious due to the differing roof heights.

7. The setback of 20cm is less than the guidance contained within the SPD, which details that two storey side extensions should normally require a 1m set back behind the front wall of a house. The reasons that the SPD advises on the set back are to make an extension appear subordinate, avoid an awkward and unsightly junction between old and new wall and roof materials, and help reduce the loss of the openness between buildings that have been built in a uniform row.
8. The setback, albeit marginal, has avoided an unsightly juncture, and the use of feature brickwork to the corner allows the extension to be seen as a subordinate, secondary addition. Moreover, further elements of subordination are achieved through the set back of the roof and lowered roofline. I note that the SPD advises that the 1m set back is normally required, but insists upon the 1m gap to the side.
9. In this instance, I consider that because a 1m gap has been realised, a marginal set back achieved, and taking into account the differing land levels; the extension is a well designed, subordinate addition that has an acceptable impact upon the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.
10. Consequently, I find compliance with Policy UR3 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan for the Bradford District, Policy Framework (October 2005), which seeks to ensure that development will not have an adverse effect on the surrounding environment; and the SPD, which seeks to ensure that proposals are well designed and complement or enhance the character of the original property and the wider area.

Other Matters

11. From my site visit, I noted that the built roof design of the front elevation canopy differs slightly from that on the proposed plan. The appeal decision does not turn on this matter, and either roof design could be considered to have an acceptable impact upon the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

12. Having had regard to all other matters raised, and for the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Katie McDonald

INSPECTOR