
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 February 2021

by C McDonagh BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 February 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/20/3263052

27 Intake Road, Bradford BD2 3JP

- 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 T Miah against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02944/HOU, dated 6 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'construction of porch to front'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling with a hipped roof, two-storey side extension and front porch. There are a range of house types in the local area. The appeal site forms part of a cluster of houses set back from Intake Road which includes two pairs of semi-detached properties set either side of a terrace of three. While alterations have taken place to the front elevations of the appeal site and the adjoining property, the terrace and the opposing pair of semis do not appear to have changed significantly to the front.
4. Due to its width and depth, the proposal would add significant mass and bulk to the front of the host property. This would be compounded by the contrasting roof designs of the proposed porch, which include both lean-to and gable arrangements. These would jar with the hipped roof of both the host building and other properties in this row. Despite the generous set-back from Intake Road, the porch would be highly visible from local vantage points. Accordingly, the proposal would have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the local area.
5. The adjoining No.29 includes a side extension with a width comparable to the host building while also projecting forward of the front elevation. While I accept this is of larger scale than the proposal before me, I understand that it was granted planning permission in 2006. It therefore significantly predates both the National Planning Policy Framework and the current development plan for

the area. In any event, I must assess the proposal on its own merits against the current policy position. Moreover, I note the spatial circumstances differ given the significant gap to that side of No.29. As such, I do not consider the extension at No.29 directly comparable to the proposal before me nor would its previous approval alter my assessment.

6. My attention is also drawn to front extensions of No's 33 and 35. I have limited information before me to substantiate any comparisons to the appeal proposal, such as plans or indeed evidence of their planning history and lawfulness. In any event, No's 33 and 35 are clearly of different design and appearance to No.27. Additionally, I would not necessarily consider these examples of good design to follow given they appear to be front conservatories of differing design and materials. I note that the adopted Householder Supplementary Planning Document (April 2012) indicates that conservatories to the front of houses are not acceptable.
7. To conclude, I find that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the local area. Consequently, it fails to comply with the requirements of Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted July 2017), which seek to ensure design is informed by a good understanding of the site/area and its context.

Other matters

8. While I note the lack of objection from occupiers of neighbouring properties, this is a neutral matter rather than carrying weight in favour of the scheme.
9. The appellant has concerns over the Council's handling of the application. However, this is a procedural issue which does not concern the planning merits of the case. Accordingly, I have not attached any weight to this matter.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is dismissed.

C McDonagh

INSPECTOR