

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 August 2017

by Martin H Seddon BSc DipTP MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 31st August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/17/3178152

266 Bradford Road, Shipley, West Yorkshire, BD18 3AE

- 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 M Miah against the decision of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref: 17/00645/HOU was refused by notice dated 10 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is: a two-storey extension to side and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey extension to side and rear at 266 Bradford Road, Shipley, West Yorkshire, BD18 3AE 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: BD/384/P01 site location plan, BD/384/P02 existing plans and elevations and PD384/P03 proposed plans and elevations.
 4. The windows in the flank elevation facing No.264 Bradford Road shall be fitted with obscure glazing and thereafter be retained.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and street scene.

Reasons

3. No.266 Bradford Road is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in a mainly residential area and facing a parade of shops across Bradford Road. The Council considers that the extension would fail to appear subordinate to the dwelling and would conflict with advice in its *Householder* supplementary planning document. This is because it would not be set down from the ridgeline or set back by 1 metre from the front elevation of the dwelling. The Council also considers that the extension would unbalance the appearance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings.

4. The other part of the semi-detached pair, No.268 has already been extended to the side. The two-storey extension that has been constructed has a very small set down from the ridge and no set back from the front elevation. It also has large bay windows at ground and first floor level which contribute towards a loss of symmetry in design for the pair of semi-detached dwellings.
5. In view of the form and design of the extension at No.268 it would be inconsistent to require a set back from the front elevation for the proposed extension at No.266. The lack of a set-down of the proposed extension from the existing ridge line would be acceptable, given that the set-down of the ridgeline of the extension to No.268 is barely perceptible. The proposed extension would cause no significant harm to the character and appearance of the building or street scene, because the original balanced appearance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings has already been lost.
6. The proposal would not conflict with Bradford Replacement Unitary Development Plan (UDP) policy D1 because it would be well related to the existing character of the locality in terms of design, scale massing and materials. It would also fail to conflict with Replacement UDP policy UR3 which requires that there should be no adverse effect from development on the surrounding environment or occupants of adjoining land.

Conditions

7. In addition to the standard timescale for commencement of development, conditions are included to ensure that the external materials complement those in the existing dwelling and requiring that development be in accordance with the approved plans. I have also added a condition to require that windows in the flank elevation of the extension are obscure glazed in the interest of protecting the privacy of neighbours.

Other Matters

8. The Council considers that the development would not affect the neighbours' amenity. I see no reason to disagree. There would be no significant loss of sunlight or daylight for the neighbouring property at No.264 because of the location of the extension at the north-western side of the appeal building. There would be no loss of privacy for the occupants of No.264 because the proposed windows in the mainly blank flank elevation of the extension would serve a bathroom and a toilet and would be obscure glazed. The extension would be located closer to the dwelling at No.264. However, there would be a gap between the extension and the boundary with No.264. This would prevent the proposed extension from being overbearing when viewed from No.264. Although neighbours have raised concerns about the effect on their house value, the impact of development on property values is not a material planning issue that can be taken into consideration.

Conclusion

9. I have taken all other matters raised into account. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed subject to conditions.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR