



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 2 June 2021

by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/20/3265687

1 Summerhill Avenue, Steeton With Eastburn BD20 6RU

- 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 Richard Mamwell against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/04174/HOU, dated 8 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Householder planning for a 2-storey extension to the west elevation including a lean-to roof and an extension to the rear elevation of an existing two-storey semi-detached house'.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. Summerhill Avenue is a residential cul-de-sac characterised by a mix of semi-detached and terraced two-storey dwellings of traditional built form. There is some variation to the width of individual dwellings on this road and those on the adjoining Summerhill Drive. However, individual pairs of semi-detached dwellings in the area more often have a strong degree of symmetry to their front elevations and where extensions have taken place these are generally subservient in scale. The appeal dwelling itself has a front elevation and window fenestration which are similarly proportioned to those on the adjoining semi-detached dwelling at No 3 Summerhill Avenue.
4. The City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council – Householder Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD) sets out amongst other things design principles for extensions to dwellings including that as a general rule, side extensions should not normally have a width that is greater than two thirds the size of the original house.
5. The width of the two-storey side extension would be comparable to the width of the original two-storey front elevation. The single three-pane window at first floor level would replicate the fenestration on the original front elevation, thereby emphasising the similar width. The extension would also project further to the side at ground floor level to facilitate the incorporation of an integral garage. This would further add to the overall perception of increased width to the front elevation. Consequently, the overall bulk and mass of the

- extension would visually compete with the scale of the host dwelling and would unbalance the pair of semi-detached dwellings that it forms part of.
6. In addition, the inadequacies of the design set out above would be compounded by the irregular shape of the two-storey side extension. In that regard, the angled splay to the side elevation would be perceptible from the street and would appear contrived and at odds with the general layout of surrounding dwellings.
 7. I acknowledge that the extension would be set back from the original front elevation and would be set down at ridge level. Even so, this would not be enough to overcome the overall dominant appearance of the extension relative to the scale of the host dwelling.
 8. The appellant contends that the overall footprint of the proposal would not be wider than the frontage created by the existing garage. However, this single storey detached garage is not comparable to the much greater bulk and mass of the proposed side extension.
 9. I have seen the written representations which give general support to the proposal some of which refer to the presence of other extensions in the area. My attention has not been drawn to any specific examples. However, the evidence before me indicates that some of the extensions in the area were considered under different development plan policies and guidance. In any case, from what I saw on site, other extensions in the area generally better respond to the scale and appearance of their respective host dwellings.
 10. I conclude that the development would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. In that regard, the development would conflict with the good design aims and requirements for development proposals to respond to the existing positive patterns of development which contribute to the character of the area in Policies DS1 (Achieving Good Design) and DS3 (Urban Character) of the City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017) and the guidance in the Council's Householder SPD.

Other Matter

11. The Council did not raise concerns in respect of the proposed single storey rear extension. From what I have seen, I find no reason to reach a different conclusion on this element of the proposals. Even so, this does not overcome my overall concerns as to the acceptability of the proposals set out under the main issue.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR