
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 February 2021

by Graeme Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705//D/20/3264846

60 Moorside Road, Eccleshill, Bradford BD2 3RB

- 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 Simon Hodges against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/03396/HOU, dated 1 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 October 2020.
 - The development proposed was described as '*1st floor side extension*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension at 60 Moorside Road, Eccleshill, Bradford BD2 3RB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/03396/HOU, dated 1 December 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: location plan; drwg ref 001; 002; drwg ref no 002-C and drwg ref no 003.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Background and Main Issue

2. Planning permission has previously been granted for a two-storey side extension at No. 60¹. The Council describe the key difference between that scheme and the proposal now before me as it having a greater setback from the front elevation of the house than the current appeal scheme. I have taken this matter into consideration in my determination of the appeal.
3. The appeal proposal was also initially described as being a first floor side extension, although subsequent submissions and the submitted plans clearly describe and show the proposal to be a two storey extension at the side of No. 60. I have revised the description accordingly in decision, above, in the interests of accuracy and precision. I am satisfied that in doing so, neither main party nor any neighbour would be disadvantaged.

¹ LPA Ref No: 20/00146/COU

4. The main issue therefore is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The Council's '*Householder*' Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) states that in order to prevent a terracing effect where semi-detached houses are built in uniform rows, a minimum gap of 1 metre between the side of the extension and the side boundary should be retained. In the case of the appeal proposal, a gap of only 0.5m would be proposed and, as such, it would fail to follow the SPD's guidance.
6. However, the previously approved scheme also only provided a 0.5m gap from its flank elevation to the boundary between Nos. 60 and 62. In that case however the Council considered that a greater front setback of 2 metres provided adequate mitigation for the 0.5m gap at the side.
7. Having carefully considered the character and appearance of No. 60 and the nature of the relationship between properties along the western side of Moorside Road, I am not persuaded that the Council's concerns about a terracing effect well-placed, particularly having previously accepted a two storey extension with a 0.5m gap at the side.
8. The proposed extension would be set back from the front corner of the house by 1m at both ground and first floor level and as a consequence it would have a lower ridge line and a set-back / set down roof-plane a consequence. Moreover, the existing front corner of the main house is already heavily recessed under the over-flying main roof and eaves. It is also further set back from the two-storey bay which dominates the central portion of this pair of semi-detached houses and is a distinctive feature of the majority of properties along the western side of Moorside Road. Thus, the properties already have well-articulated façades which add to the pleasant character and rhythm along the street which is derived largely from these features and also from their hipped roofs.
9. The Council have already accepted with the previous grant of planning permission the principle of an extension at the side of No. 60 with a gap to the side boundary of 0.5m. In so doing, the effect that this would have on the spacing between properties and the rhythm of the gaps along the street has also been accepted. The appeal proposal would be no different to the approved scheme in respect of the space at the side of No. 60, and I am not persuaded that the reduced setback of 1m proposed in this instance would materially affect how the proposed extension would be seen in the context of the appeal property, the neighbouring property and the street as a whole.
10. I am satisfied that the proposed extension would be a suitably well-designed and subordinate extension to No. 60 which, taken together with the nature, character and appearance of the existing building, would employ sufficient design features to avoid the type of cramped terrace effect that the SPD seeks to resist. I acknowledge that the proposal would not be entirely consistent with the guidance and advice set out in the SPD with regard to gaps at the side of side extensions. However, I am satisfied that it would secure good design, would respond positively to prevailing patterns of development and be appropriate in terms of its layout, scale, materials and appearance in the context of Moorside Road. As such, it would align with the aims and principles

of Core Strategy policies DS1 and DS3, and also with the broad design principles set out in the SPD despite a technical breach of the boundary inset guidance set out therein.

Conditions

11. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in light of the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the time limit and plans conditions, which are necessary and reasonable in order to provide certainty, a condition to ensure matching materials is also necessary and reasonable in the interests of character and appearance. No further conditions have been suggested, nor do I consider any others to be necessary.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Graeme Robbie

INSPECTOR