



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17th July 2017

by Alison Roland BSc DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 31 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/17/3175978

32 Bromford Road, Bradford, West Yorkshire, BD4 7RE

- 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 Arfan Ali against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref: 16/09493/HOU, dated 21 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 24 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is construction of side and rear extension.
-

Procedural Matter

1. The site layout plan depicts the existing garage re-sited towards the rear of the plot. However, this did not form part of the description of the development on the application forms and has not been referred to by the Council in its consideration of the proposal. I have therefore likewise determined the appeal on the basis that it did not form part of the proposals.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of side and rear extension at 32 Bromford Road, Bradford, West Yorkshire, BD4 7RE, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 16/09493/HOU, dated 21 December 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: Drawing No: 100 Dated 5/12/16: Existing Plans and Elevations; Drawing No: 200 Dated 5/12/16: Proposed Plans and Elevations.
 - 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 dwelling.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, (or any Order revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no additional windows shall be inserted in the North Western side elevation of the extension hereby permitted without express planning permission.
-

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the implications of the proposal for the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The proposed extension would retain an inset from the side boundary at first floor but the single storey element beneath would abut the side boundary. This would conflict with the advice in the Local Development Framework for Bradford *Householder* Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (SPD), which seeks to secure a minimum 1 metre gap between such an extension and the side boundary to avoid a terracing effect and maintain access to the rear of the property. Neither of the latter matters form the basis of the Council's concern, which instead rests on the provision of a small section of lean to roof which straddles the front and side of the single storey element.
5. However, the lean-to roof being a relatively small component of the overall scheme and with a roof pitch comparable with the house roof, would not look out of place and is a common design approach to accommodate a difference between the ground floor and first floor plates of an extension. Moreover, it is not uncharacteristic of the area as several properties in the immediate vicinity employ a similar shallow lean-to roof across their frontages, including the property attached to the appeal premises and others across the street. In this context, it would appear unremarkable.
6. Whilst the ground floor of the extension would also not meet the 1 metre set back from the front elevation suggested in the SPD, the combined effect of the inset at first floor front and side elevations and lower ridge line to the roof relative to the host property, would ensure that it would appear as a subordinate and sympathetic addition thereto.
7. For these reasons and notwithstanding that the design of the extension would not follow the letter of the advice in the SPD, I nonetheless consider it would harmonise satisfactorily with the host dwelling and would not harm the wider character and appearance of the area. I thus find no conflict with Policies D1 and UR3 of the Bradford Replacement Unitary Development Plan (2005), which seek to secure high quality design in new development which is well related to and does not have an adverse effect on the character of its surroundings.
8. In addition to the standard time limit for commencement of development, the Council suggest a condition requiring the development to be implemented in accordance with the submitted plans and this is necessary for the avoidance of doubt. A matching materials condition is also necessary to secure a satisfactory finished appearance, particularly as the application form refers to "stone to match existing" which is ambiguous as the building walls comprise brick and painted render. A condition removing permitted development rights for the insertion of additional windows in the side of the extension is necessary to protect the privacy of occupiers in the adjacent property to the side.

ALISON ROLAND

INSPECTOR