
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2020

by R Cooper BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/19/3239853

58 Moore Avenue, Bradford BD6 3HU

- 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 Majid against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/03087/HOU, dated 18 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side / rear extension, dormer window to the front and rear, and a porch to principal elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a double storey side / rear extension, dormer window to the front and rear, and a porch to principal elevation at 58 Moore Avenue, Bradford BD6 3HU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/03087/HOU, dated 18 July 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans: BC(0)1, BC(0)2 and BC(0)3.
 - 3) 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.

Procedural Matters

2. The application form and the Council's decision notice both refer to the proposal as retrospective. However, during my site visit I could see that the front dormer and porch constructed on site appeared materially larger. Therefore, for certainty I have considered the appeal on the proposals detailed in the submitted drawings.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached two storey dwelling, with a third floor in the roof space. The dwelling is located to the north-eastern side of Moore Avenue, set back from the road by the parking area to the front. The street is characterised by a mix of detached and semi-detached houses, predominantly 2-storey, with a mix of hipped and gabled roofs. The majority of houses are constructed in a similar architectural style and materials.
5. Whilst the proposal does not strictly adhere to the design principals regarding terracing in the Householder Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), it would not be on the boundary, and a degree of separation would be retained. This combined with a lower ridge height than the original house, and a set back at the first floor level would result in a subordinate extension, which would be in keeping with the property, and not harm the character of the street scene.
6. I have considered the Council's concerns regarding terracing, however there is no evidence before me that the neighbouring property is likely to similarly extend, or that the cumulative effect of such developments would necessarily be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. In any event, I must determine the appeal on the evidence before me.
7. I have considered the design principal on page 20 of the SPD regarding staggered front elevations. However, this relates to buildings with flat front walls, whereas the appeal property has a varied frontage created by a two storey bay window, and a porch. While the front elevation of the extension would have a staggered appearance, it would be behind the main front elevation of the house and would not appear prominent or incongruous.
8. Overall, I find that the extension would appear unobtrusive within the context of the site. It would not have a detrimental impact on the street scene, and consequently the character and appearance of the area would not be harmed. I consider the proposed materials to be acceptable, and a planning condition would ensure the bricks used would match the existing, and that the roof materials are similar to the existing roof.
9. Consequently, the development would not harm the character and appearance of the area and is consistent with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Local Plan for the Bradford District Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017), which seek to ensure that development is of high quality design, that respects local context and integrates within its surroundings. It is also consistent with the design objectives in paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

10. I have considered the concerns from neighbouring residents regarding the appearance of the porch on site, blue lighting, and lack of access to the rear. However, this does not alter my findings on the main issue above.
11. I have no reason to disagree with the Council that the proposal would not cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of surrounding properties.
12. The matters raised by residents in relation to loss of property values, trespassing, and the appellant canvassing for support, do not affect my findings.

Conditions

13. I have attached the standard time limit condition, and a plans condition to provide certainty. I have also attached a condition concerning external materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

R Cooper

INSPECTOR