

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2020

by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/20/3256834
113 Mandale Road, Bradford BD6 3JX

- 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 Mark Frith against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01040/HOU, dated 13 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is for a part single and part two storey extension to side and two storey extension to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is refused.

Procedural Matter

2. For the sake of brevity and clarity I have used the description of development from the Council's decision notice.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The surrounding area is characterised primarily by residential properties positioned in a linear form. The housing styles in the area are traditional in nature with pitched roofs a prominent feature. Some properties have been extended including a number which have built side extensions some of which extend up to the side boundary.
5. The proposed flat roof part of the extension, including lantern and parapet aspects, would be unusual features that would be prominent and not in keeping with the architectural styles of the surrounding area. This part of the extension would be a discordant form of development that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
6. Whilst the extension would be built up to the side boundary, the staggered form of the overall development with parts of the extension set back would ensure a terracing effect is not created. Nevertheless, this matter would not outweigh the harm I have identified above.
7. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal would conflict

with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Local Plan for the Bradford District Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2017 and Design Principal 1 of the Local Development Framework for Bradford Householder Supplementary Planning Document which seeks development to maintain or improve the character and quality of the original house and wider area.

8. My attention has been drawn to a number of developments in the area including extensions at 120 Mandale Road and 58 Moore Avenue. I do not consider these developments to be directly comparable to the appeal scheme, particularly with regards to the roof form. In any case I have determined the appeal on its own merits. The appellant has suggested that the flat roof could be changed to a pitched roof. I have considered the scheme that was before me. I have also had regard to the email correspondence with the Council, but these do not alter my findings on the main issue.
9. The proposal would provide existing and future occupants of the property with greater living space that would improve housing stock in the area, which is a benefit that I attach modest weight. The appellant has stated that the proposal is required to increase their family by adoption. However, there is no supporting evidence in respect of this matter or whether alternative means of accommodation has been sought and thus I attach minimal weight to this matter. These benefits would not outweigh the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR