



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2021

by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/20/3263549

78 The Oval, Bingley, West Yorkshire BD16 4RQ

- 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 Tony Lee against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02288/HOU, dated 9 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two storey extension to side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a two-storey, detached dwelling located within a residential area. The dwelling is prominent within the street scene due to the curve of the road and topography of the area. The design of properties within the surrounding area varies. Nonetheless, the appeal property forms part of a short row of three uniform, detached dwellings.
4. To ensure that the character and quality of the original house and wider area are maintained the Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) recommends that two-storey side extensions should be set back 1 metre from the principal elevation and a 1m gap should be maintained to the side boundary. The scheme would not meet this guidance.
5. The proposed extension would not appear subservient to the host property due to the minimal set back from the principal elevation and because the roof ridge would not be set down from the original property. Accordingly, the original design of the house would not be preserved, and the extension would result in an unsympathetic addition.
6. The gap to the side of the property makes a positive contribution to the area and reflects the character of both the three detached dwellings and properties on this side of The Oval. In this section of the street scene, these dwellings have a driveway to the side which provides a regular pattern of development and sense of spaciousness. The scheme would erode an important gap and

reduce the sense of openness of both the site and surrounding area. It would also appear cramped within the plot, because it would fill the majority of the gap to the side boundary, and would be conspicuous from the highway due to its scale, massing and siting.

7. The appellant has highlighted that the scheme would be similar to 169 The Oval and the properties opposite the appeal site which have a garage in line with the front elevation and a small gap to the side. The appeal scheme cannot be directly compared to No 169 nor the properties opposite as they have not been extended to the side and the garages are part of the original house. Furthermore, the scale and massing of the single-storey garages opposite the site are significantly less than the appeal scheme and there are large gaps to either side of No 169 and the adjacent properties.
8. For these reasons, the proposed development would be visually harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Consequently, it would conflict with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Local Plan for the Bradford District: Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017) which seek to ensure, amongst other matters, that development proposals achieve good design which is appropriate to its context.
9. I acknowledge the matters raised by the appellant including the scheme would provide additional living accommodation for them and their family, the personal circumstances of the appellant's extended family, compliance with other local planning policies, access to the rear would be maintained, building experience, high quality materials and no objections from neighbouring properties. However, these are not considerations which would outweigh the harm identified. Likewise, the absence of harm and compliance with other local planning policies does not amount to a positive factor in favour of the scheme.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

L M Wilson

INSPECTOR