

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 June 2020 by C McDonagh BA (Hons), MA

by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/20/3245759

2 Granby Drive, Riddlesden, Keighley BD20 5AX

- 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 Mrs Rehela Qados against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02076/HOU, dated 9 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing garage and rear extension, and the formation of a 2 storey extension to the side and rear of an existing 2 storey building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and street scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached, two-storey dwelling with a hipped roof located on a corner plot. This side of Granby Drive is comprised of matching house types, with a general pattern consisting of generous front gardens and gaps between houses. The opposite side contains a more varied mix of styles, such as the new detached property opposite the appeal site.
5. The proposal involves the erection of a two-storey side and single-storey rear extension which would wrap around the property. This would replace the garage and rear extension indicated on the submitted plan, although I observed on the site visit these have been removed.
6. My attention is drawn to the Householder Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD), which advises extensions should not appear to dominate the original house. Two-storey extensions will normally require a 1 metre set back behind the front wall of a house, with a corresponding lowering of the roofline.

7. The proposal would sit flush with the front elevation and main ridge line of the property, contrary to this guidance. As a result, the extension would dominate the host building, adding substantial mass to the side and lacking subordination. This would be exacerbated by its location on a prominent corner plot at the junction of Granby Drive and Granby Lane. While this property has a larger space to the side than others on the street and would not cause a terracing effect, it would cause one side to appear significantly larger than the other. While there are other extensions to properties in the area, this is not uncommon in a residential area and none are of this scale. The proposal before me would significantly unbalance this pair, causing harm to character and appearance of the street scene.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to existing extensions at No.6 and No.10 Granby Drive, which I observed on the site visit. However, it was apparent neither are directly comparable to the proposal before me. No.6 is a two-storey side extension which includes a notable set back from the front elevation at first floor level, while No.10 is single storey. While neither is set back at ground floor level, this is not uncommon in the street scene, with the former garage at the appeal site an example of this. Both also appear to be of some age. Regardless, I can only assess the proposal before me on its own merits against current policy and neither would justify the harm I have identified.
9. To conclude on the main issue, as set out above, the proposal would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the host buildings and local area. Consequently, it fails to comply with the SPD and the requirements of Policies DS1, DS3 and SC9 of the Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document (CSDPD). Collectively, these seek to ensure design is informed by a good understanding of the site/area and its context.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has submitted personal information in support of the proposal which I have taken into consideration. I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) contained in section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, which sets out the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. Nevertheless, for the reasons set out above, it does not follow from the PSED that the appeal should succeed.

Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, including the letters of support, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C McDonagh

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR