

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 June 2020

by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/20/3244830

262 Parkside Road, West Bowling, Bradford BD5 8RB

- 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 Ahmed Zaman against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/04315/HOU, dated 15 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as "two storey side and single storey rear extension and front and rear dormer windows."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. A proposed porch is shown on the submitted plans and forms part of the Council's assessment. Whilst the porch is not included in the description of development, I have considered this element when determining the appeal.
3. The Council have not raised any concerns with regards to the proposed rear extension and dormer extensions. I have therefore assessed this appeal only on the proposed side extension and porch.
4. At the time of my site visit, dormer windows had been constructed on the appeal property. I have dealt with the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The surrounding area is characterised predominantly by semi-detached residential properties. The appeal site sits on a corner location and forms part of a row of semi-detached properties which have traditional architectural detailing. It is this traditional architecture of the properties which contributes positively to the character of the area.
7. The proposed extensions, including the porch and projection to the front of the side extension, would be a complicated arrangement that would detract from the traditional architecture in the surrounding area. There are bushes within the garden of the appeal site however these would not completely screen the proposed development. The design of the extensions and the amount of glazing

proposed would introduce an incongruous structure that would not reflect the pattern of development in the immediate area.

8. I have had regard to the appellants statement of case including examples of extensions on other houses on Parkside Road, Springwood Gardens and the wider Bradford area. However, I do not consider these to be directly comparable to the proposal subject of this appeal, particularly with regards to location and design. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits. I have had regard to the appellants requirements for the internal arrangement to incorporate a shower room and also the submitted MP's letter. These matters however do not outweigh the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
9. I therefore find that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. The proposal would not accord with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the City of Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2017 and Design Principle 5 of the City of Bradford Householder Supplementary Planning Document which, amongst other things, seeks proposals to contribute to the character of the area.

Conclusion

10. I conclude that for the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR