



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 September 2019

by Graeme Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 8 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/19/3233667

9 Ardennes Close, Bradford BD2 1HD

- 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 H Ali against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01022/HOU, dated 14 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is retrospective construction of extension to rear and removal of dormer extension to second floor and increase of roof ridge.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modern detached house located at the head of a short cul-de-sac. Like much of the surrounding estate, Ardennes Close is situated on rising ground. Levels rise noticeably from the entrance into the cul-de-sac from Farriers Croft towards the turning head at the top. No. 9 is located off to the left of the turning head upon entry, tucked away somewhat at the end of a shared driveway.
4. The front elevation of the already extended property currently has a modest but well-proportioned appearance; the two storey side extension returns behind the front elevation of the main house, and its proportions broadly reflect those of the host property. The rear of the property is a different matter however, dominated as it is by a three storey flat roofed rear extension, and attached single storey extensions.
5. The proposal would broadly retain a three storey extension at the rear but would replace the flat roofed box-like structure at roof level with a more conventional pitched roof with gabled rear elevation. The result would, on the face of it, be a slightly less visually challenging form of extension than presently exists, particularly at its upper and roof levels.
6. Whilst this approach should be broadly commended, the a pitched roof above a three storey extension would do little to diminish the overall width of this element of the rear elevation, whilst the gable peak would be a sizeable and dominant feature at the rear of the property. Moreover, any benefit arising

from the replacement of the box-extension would not be particularly widely felt given the relatively secluded position at the rear of the dwelling and the degree of screening afforded by the conifer hedge around the boundary of the property, and the trees on the adjacent land.

7. However, the proposal also incorporates an increase in the height of the roof structure, with a corresponding increase in the height of the roof ridge. It would achieve this, not by increasing the angle of the roof pitch but by adding additional height to each of the property's elevations. The result being that there would be a considerable area of 'dead' façade between the top of the first floor windows and the eaves level. Thus, the first floor windows would 'float' awkwardly within the front and rear façades and as a consequence the proposal would result in an awkward, ill-proportioned and incongruously extended dwelling with a top-heavy appearance at odds with the broadly consistent theme of house types within the surrounding area.
8. Any benefits arising from the revisions to the rear and side elevation through the replacement of the box element with a conventional pitched roof would, for reasons outlined above, be localised and limited. However, even with the revised roof details of this rear element, a three storey extension would be an unduly and uncharacteristically dominant form of extension at odds with the character, scale and appearance of the host property. Furthermore, the jarring and discordant nature of the proposal to raise the height of the overall roof structure would be harmful and incongruous in its own right, whilst further compounding the inappropriate scale of the rear extension.
9. The proposal would for these reasons be a dominant, awkward and unsympathetic addition to the appeal property. As such, the proposal would fail to achieve the type of high quality design which policies DS1 and DS3 of the Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document and would be contrary to those policies. The proposal would also be in conflict with the guidance set out within the Council's *'Householder Supplementary Planning Document'*, which advises that extensions should maintain or improve the character and quality of the original house and wider area and should be subordinate to and not dominate the original house.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Graeme Robbie

INSPECTOR