

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2020 by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/20/3262453

8 Cockshott Lane, Idle, Bradford BD10 8UE

- 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 Miss Ghosia Amir against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02452/HOU, dated 15 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey front and side, single storey side and rear extensions, balcony and internal alterations.
-

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.

Procedural Matter

3. The Council has raised concern that a plan which identified the application site with a red line boundary was not submitted with the planning application. Nevertheless, the Council went on to consider that the black line shown on the block plan included on 'Sheet No: One, Ground Floor Plan (Proposed)' identified the boundary and extent of the site. The appellant has confirmed that this is the extent of the site. As such, I consider this plan clearly identifies the appeal site. Moreover, there is no suggestion that the Certificate of Ownership relating to the site is incorrect and therefore I am satisfied that interested parties would not be prejudiced by my consideration of the appeal on the basis of that plan.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - (i) The character and appearance of the host dwelling, and
 - (ii) The living conditions of occupiers of No 10 Cockshott Lane, with particular regard to privacy.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a large 2 storey detached dwelling which is located towards the end of a cul-de-sac within a predominantly residential area. Permission is sought for extensions and alterations to all of its elevations.

Character and appearance

6. The appeal dwelling has a simple design and form, with the main body of the dwelling arranged in a linear layout under a continuous asymmetrical roof. There are 2 storey gable sections which project from the main roof on the north and south elevations and a small, visually lightweight conservatory to one side.
7. Design Principle 1 of the Householder Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD) states that the size, position and form of extensions should maintain or improve the character and quality of the original house. The proposed development would extend the host dwelling through a combination of single and 2 storey extensions on all sides. They would introduce substantially greater massing and several different roof pitches which would significantly alter the design of the dwelling and prevent its form from being read. As such, the proposal would fail to read as a subservient addition and would be overly dominant to the dwelling.
8. Furthermore, the host dwelling has a regular window layout with good balance between the glazing and stone. The proposed development would significantly increase the amount of glazing. In particular, much of the front elevation would be dominated by a series of substantial ground and first floor windows, some of which would be double height. Such a significant amount of glazing would be disproportionate and overbearing. Accordingly, the proposal would fail to respect the appearance of the dwelling.
9. Photographs of other properties which have been extended have been submitted in support of this appeal. Additionally, a plan of No 300 Killinghall Road has been provided. However, the information is limited and thus I cannot determine whether the circumstances under which planning permission was granted, or the context of the examples, are directly comparable to the proposal before me. As such, the examples do not justify this appeal. Moreover, notwithstanding the examples referred to, I have considered this appeal on its own merits.
10. It is acknowledged that the appellant requires a large dwelling for their family and that the appeal site is of a generous size which would allow for extensions and development. However, there is no conclusive evidence before me which indicates that the required amount of accommodation could not be achieved with an extension of a more suitable design.
11. Consequently, due to the overall mass, scale, design and positioning of the extensions, this proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling. It would therefore conflict with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Local Plan for the Bradford District, Core Strategy, Development Plan Document (July 2017) (the CS) and the SPD which seek to ensure developments achieve good design and are informed by and appropriate to their context.

Living conditions

12. The proposed development includes a large first floor balcony to the west of the host property. It would abut the side boundary of the appeal site and No 10 Cockshott Lane.
13. At the time of my site visit I observed that there are extensive mature trees and planting along this boundary. Only very limited glimpses of No 10, which is positioned a considerable distance away from the boundary, can be achieved through the existing trees. During the summer months, when the balcony is likely to be used most, the trees and planting would be in full leaf thus increasing the already extensive screening to No 10. Whilst landscaping is not permanent, all the current trees and plants are within the boundary of No 10 and therefore could be controlled and managed by its occupiers.
14. Consequently, this proposal would not cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers at No 10 Cockshott Lane with regard to privacy and it therefore does not conflict with Policy DS5 of the CS which seeks to ensure developments do not harm the amenity of existing residents.

Other Matters

15. Concern has been raised over how the Council dealt with the planning application. This is not a matter for me in the context of this appeal and I have considered the proposal strictly on its merits and have found it would cause harm as identified above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hannah Ellison

Appeal Planning Officer

Inspector's Decision

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

Susan Ashworth

INSPECTOR