

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 June 2021

**by Diane Cragg DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 05 July 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/21/3267555**

**4 Hallowes Grove, Cullingworth, Bingley BD13 5AT**

- 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 Christopher Snowden against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
  - The application Ref 20/05419/HOU, dated 26 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 January 2021.
  - The development proposed is two storey side extension and replacement of a flat roof on existing rear extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached house typical of the wider suburban neighbourhood. It is designed with a gable brick side wall with pebble dash and stonework to the front elevation. Within Hallowes Grove there is a variety of dwelling types with largely single storey dwellings towards the head of the cul-de-sac and pairs of semi-detached houses of similar design and following a mostly consistent building line at the cul-de-sac entrance. Properties are set back from the road behind good sized front gardens and spaces between buildings provide access to garages mostly located to the rear. Due to the space between dwellings and their set back from the road the street has a pleasant and reasonably spacious feel.
4. The Bradford Householder Supplementary Planning Document adopted in April 2012 (SPD) advises that both single and two storey side extensions should normally be positioned behind the front wall of a house to preserve the original design of the house, to avoid awkward and unsightly junctions between old and new walls and to help reduce the loss of openness between buildings. A 1 metre set back is normally sought with the corresponding lowering of the roofline. Further, where semi-detached houses are in a uniform row the Council will insist that a minimum gap of 1 metre to the side boundary should be retained to prevent a cramped 'terracing effect'.

5. The extension would be set down from the roof line and back at first floor level in accordance with the SPD. The siting of the ground floor in line with the front elevation would sit acceptably with the house in as much as the likely construction detail would not result in an unsightly junction between materials.
6. Even so, extending up to the side boundary, with the ground floor in line with the front of the property would erode the space around the dwelling. The dwelling as extended would fill the width of the plot. It would result in the extension appearing prominent in the street and cramped in its plot. Consequently, the extension would not be in keeping with the relatively spacious character of the street and would detract from the street scene. Furthermore, given the extension's siting on the boundary, it would be likely to contribute to a terracing effect should No 6 be extended in the future. This would exacerbate the effect of the proposal on the street scene.
7. I note the approval of a similar scheme for a two storey side extension at the property in 2008, however, this approval was prior to the Council adopting its SPD and in any case that extension was set in from the joint boundary by a small amount. Whilst I appreciate that the low side boundary retaining wall may be defective this is not sufficient justification for the extension to be constructed on the side boundary. There is not enough information before me to conclude that the wall could not be repaired prior to the construction of an extension.
8. Adjacent properties on Hallows Grove have not been extended to the side at two storeys, but I noted at my site visit that a number of similar semi-detached houses on Hallows Park Road have been. I observed the other extensions referred to by the appellant during my site visit. It appears that most of these extensions were approved prior to the SPD being adopted or are set back at both ground and first floor level (No29 Hallows Park Road). In any case the extensions on Hallows Park Road do not change my view in relation to the appeal scheme which is within a row of properties where the gaps between dwellings is part of the spacious character of the street.
9. Overall, the proposed development would detract from the character and appearance of the host property and the area. It would conflict with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Bradford District Core Strategy July 2017 which seeks to ensure development is of good design which responds to the existing positive patterns of development. It would also conflict with the SPD.

### **Other Matters**

10. I appreciate that the extension could be built of matching materials, that the local parish council and local residents did not object to the proposals and that no parking space would be lost. However, these matters do not affect my judgement on the main issue.

### **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

*Diane Cragg*, INSPECTOR