
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 June 2021

by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/21/3270858
234 Clayton Road, Bradford BD7 2RB

- 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 Wasiq Javed against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref: 21/00007/HOU, dated 3 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is a front porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a front porch extension at 234 Clayton Road, Bradford BD7 2RB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 21/00007/HOU, dated 3 January 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: 1/D/P-1/2019.
 - 2) 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.

Procedural Matter

2. It was apparent from my site visit that the development has commenced. The description of development contained within the Council's decision notice refers to the development as retrospective, as does the description on the planning application form. I have based my decision on the submitted plan that the Council provided with its appeal questionnaire, not the plan that the appellant provided with the same reference that shows a different designed development. In the event that the approved plan does not reflect what has been built on the site, that is a matter for the main parties.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an end of terrace 2 storey house. It currently has a large porch-like structure across its front elevation. The neighbouring property

at 232 Clayton Road (No 232) has a porch which sits centrally on its front elevation. On the opposite side of the appeal site is an enclosed footpath, beyond which is vegetation associated with the next property. On the same side of the road as the site, the area is residential in character with terraced properties amongst a mix of other housing types. Opposite, properties are more commercial in nature, including a nearby retail park.

5. The front porch extension would be on a subservient scale when seen against the much larger size of the main house. The side walls would be well set off the side boundaries of the site and its maximum height would be below the windows at first floor level. As such, its size and scale would not be excessive. The roof form and the external materials would be in keeping with the house and it would sit fairly comfortably on its front elevation.
6. The wider visibility of the front porch extension in the wider streetscene would be limited by No 232's porch, together with the enclosure and vegetation around the footpath. Clear visibility would only likely arise from directly outside the site on Clayton Road and opposite. Hence, it would not be in an unduly prominent location.
7. That the front porch extension would not be centrally sited on the house would not detract from the local character to an untoward degree. It would not appear over dominant, due to its proportions. Even on the side where it would be closest to the boundary, a not insignificant gap from the side wall to the boundary would still remain.
8. Accordingly, the front porch extension would not appear incongruous in the street. Whilst it would be in overall terms larger than the porch of No 232, the projection forward from the front elevation of the host property towards the road would be modest in terms of its visual presence. That Clayton Road is a busy thoroughfare does not change that the front porch extension would not be to the detriment of visual amenity.
9. The Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD) applies design principles, including for porches. With the fairly modest proposed size of the front porch extension and as there is not a particular uniform appearance that is a distinctive characteristic with the mix of residential and commercial buildings, there would be broad compliance with the SPD. As the proposal would not be unacceptable, where the SPD concerns the specific needs of a person does not require further consideration.
10. I conclude that the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the building and the area. Therefore, it would comply with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Local Plan for the Bradford District Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017) where they are concerned with achieving good design and high quality places, being informed by a good understanding of the site/area and its context, and that proposals should create a strong sense of place and be appropriate to their context in terms of layout, scale, density, details and materials, amongst other considerations.
11. It would also accord with the SPD where it seeks to ensure that proposals are well designed and complement or enhance the character of the original property and the wider area.

Conditions

12. As works have already taken place, a condition concerning the statutory timescale for commencement is not necessary. In order that the planning permission reflects the submitted plan for the purposes of certainty, a condition is imposed concerning the approved plan. A condition is also imposed so that matching external materials to the existing house are used in order to protect the character and appearance of the building and the area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all matters that have been raised, the appeal should be allowed subject to the conditions.

Darren Hendley

INSPECTOR