



---

## Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 3 August 2021

**by G Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 11 August 2021**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/21/3278748**

**6 Aireville Drive, Silsden BD20 0HU**

- 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 Steven Dent against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
  - The application Ref 21/01727/HOU, dated 30 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 June 2021.
  - The development proposed is double story extension to the side and single to the rear of the property.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for double story extension to the side and single to the rear of the property at 6 Aireville Drive, Silsden BD20 0HU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01727/HOU, dated 30 March 2021, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: existing site plan; existing plans; proposed site plan Rev A; proposed plans Rev A and proposed double & single storey extension Rev A.
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

3. The Council's '*Householder*' Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) provides advice and guidance on design principles in relation to, amongst other things, extensions<sup>1</sup>. It states that, as a general rule, extensions should not appear to dominate the original house or neighbouring properties and should complement the original design of the property and wider area.
4. Extensions that are subordinate to the original house are cited in the SPD as one example of how to approach domestic extensions. In the context of side

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 2: Design Principles – Design Principle 1, p10-p11

extensions, the SPD goes on to advise that in order to prevent a terracing effect where semi-detached houses are built in uniform rows, extensions should incorporate a minimum set-back of 1 metre from the existing front wall of the house, with a corresponding lowering of the roofline. A minimum gap of 1 metre between the side of the extension and the side boundary should also be retained to 'prevent a cramped terracing effect'.

5. The proposed extension would be set back from the existing front wall by 1 metre and, as a consequence, the roof ridge and roof slope would be correspondingly lower than those of the existing house. The extension would, in the parlance of the SPD, appear as a well-proportioned and subordinate extension to the main house which would also maintain the original character and features of the main house.
6. The Council's only concern relates to the proposal's inset from the plot's side boundary. The appeal property is part of a row of five pairs of semi-detached properties which, as the SPD cautions<sup>2</sup>, are built in a uniform row with broadly similar spacing between.
7. The proposed extension would be set in from the side boundary, but not by 1m. Rather, at 0.5 metres the extension would, the Council argue, result in a cramped terracing effect and a reduction in the sense of separation between dwellings. The latter would inevitably occur with a two-storey side extension, the principle of which the Council do not seem to object to. However, in terms of reducing or avoiding a terracing effect, I am satisfied that the combination of a 1 metre front set back, correspondingly lower roofline and 0.5 metre side inset would avoid both actual and perceived terracing.
8. The proposal would retain some, if somewhat limited, circulation space around the extension within the site, whilst the boundary inset, front set-back and lowered roofline with hipped roof would retain the fundamental sense of rhythm and spacing evident between buildings along Aireville Drive. The neighbouring property at No. 4 has not been extended at the side and so a not-insignificant gap between buildings would be retained, ensuring a satisfactory degree of separation. Should the neighbouring property be extended in the future, the current proposal would provide a basis for maintaining an effective physical and visual gap between the properties, consistent with the broad character and appearance of Aireville Drive.
9. I am satisfied that the proposed extension would be a suitably well-designed and subordinate extension which, taken together with the nature, character and appearance of the existing building, would employ sufficient design features to avoid the type of cramped terrace effect that the SPD seeks to resist. I acknowledge that the proposal would not be entirely consistent with the guidance and advice set out in the SPD with regard to gaps at the side of side extensions. However, I am satisfied that it would secure good design, would respond positively to prevailing patterns of development and be appropriate in terms of its layout, scale, materials and appearance in the context of Aireville Drive. As such, it would align with the aims and principles of Core Strategy policies DS1 and DS3, and also with the broad design principles set out in the SPD despite a technical breach of the boundary inset guidance set out therein.

---

<sup>2</sup> p11 – Distance to side boundary and maximum width of extensions

### **Conditions**

10. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in light of the advice set out in the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. I agree that time limit and plans conditions are necessary and reasonable in order to provide certainty and in the interests of good plans. Although the plans refer to matching materials, I am not persuaded that there is sufficient certainty in relation to materials so I have attached a matching materials condition.

### **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons set out above, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*G Robbie*

INSPECTOR