The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 October 2020

by Diane Cragg DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/20/3257533
36 Bunting Drive, Bradford BD6 3XE

- 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 Ali Hanif against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
- The application Ref 20/01305/HOU, dated 7 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 June 2020.
- The development proposed is rear extension, extension on top of existing garage, demolition of existing conservatory, front remodel and internal works.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on (i) the character and appearance of the host property and the area and (ii) the living conditions of No 34 Bunting Drive.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is a detached property with attached double garage occupying a corner plot at the head of a cul-de sac. It is part of an estate of mainly detached properties of similar style and materials with varied siting and orientation. As a result, there is a relatively consistent and harmonious character and appearance to the street scene.

4. To the north of the property is Asa Briggs Park and to the west is Stocks Lane Primary School. The rear and side of the property form part of the backdrop to the park and the school playground.

5. The existing pitched roofed double garage sits slightly forward of the main house. The proposed first-floor extension above the garage would be designed with a front facing gable elevation and a hipped roof to the rear and to the side. Although the height of the extension would be marginally below the height of the main house, due to a combination of its width, its front gable detail and its forward projection, it would be an overly dominant feature that would detract from the proportions of the existing property. Consequently, even though the appeal property is set back behind No 34 Bunting Drive, the

first-floor extension would be visible in the cul-de-sac and would appear incongruous in the street scene.

6. I appreciate that the main house has a side gable wall that is higher than the extension. However, the side gable elevation sits alongside the side elevation of its neighbour and its proportion and detailing relate to the design and depth of the house and is not prominent in the street scene.

7. I note the details provided by the appellant of other gable elevations in the street and wider area, including the neighbouring property, and I accept that gable details are part of the street scene. However, these other gable details are mostly conceived as part of the original house design and have different proportions to the proposed extension.

8. The hipped roof of the first-floor extension would be visible from Asa Briggs Park above the hedged boundary of the appeal property. The context in which the extension would be seen from the park is sufficiently varied for the extension to sit acceptably in these views.

9. There are a number of proposed alterations to the fenestration of the dwelling due to the design of the extension and the altered internal arrangement. The changes include enlarged entrance door, first floor window above the entrance and additional roof lights and windows on the elevation of the property facing Asa Briggs Park.

10. Within Bunting Drive there are various entrance door and porch details. I am satisfied that there is enough variation within the estate for the proposed entrance detail to sit acceptably within the street scene. From the Park the new windows would not be especially prominent, and their design and detail would relate acceptably to the existing property and surrounding context.

11. The Council does not raise any concerns about the design of the single storey extension with regard to the character and appearance of the area and following my site visit I see no reason to disagree.

12. Nevertheless, overall the proposal would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host property and the area in conflict with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Bradford District Core Strategy Development Plan Document (July 2017) (Core Strategy) which collectively seek to achieve good design and high quality places where development is appropriate in its context. It would also conflict with the Householder Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) where its design principles require the size, position and form of extensions to maintain or improve the character and quality of the original building.

Living conditions

13. The side elevation of the garage sits adjacent to the rear garden of No 34 Bunting Drive. There is an existing pedestrian access around to the back of the property which separates the elevation from the side boundary. The extension above the garage and the single storey extension to the rear of the garage would increase the amount of built development adjacent to No 34's boundary.

14. The rear garden of No 34 faces north and is at a slightly lower land level than the appeal site. The appeal site sits to the west of No 34 and the additional development adjacent to the boundary would not reduce daylight or sunlight

into the garden area because of the siting of the existing house and because the mass of the extension is set in from the boundary.

15. Further, due to the hipped roof design of the first floor extension, the limited height of the single storey extension and the set in from the joint boundary, the development would not detract from the outlook from the windows in No 34 which have a limited and oblique view of the side of the appeal property.

16. Consequently, I consider that the proposal would not detract from the living conditions of No 34 and would accord with the requirements of Policy DS5 of the Core Strategy which seeks to protect the amenity of existing residents. It would also accord with the SPD which aims to ensure that development does not cause unacceptable harm to the privacy of neighbours.

Conclusion

17. Although I find that the extensions would not detract from the living conditions of No 34 Bunting Drive; for the reasons given the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the appeal property and the area. Therefore, for the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR