



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 14 September 2021

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/21/3279832

27 Oakdale Road, Shipley BD18 1PE

- 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 K Ratcliffe against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01921/HOU, dated 30 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is two storey side and single storey rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey side and single storey rear extensions at 27 Oakdale Road, Shipley BD18 1PE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/01921/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 plan: PDA21-051-01 A.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in materials to match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. Oakdale Road is characterised by a regular arrangement of two-storey, semi-detached houses separated by driveways to the side.
4. The Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) advises that two-storey side extensions will normally require a 1 metre set back behind the front wall of a house, with a corresponding lowering of the roofline. In addition, where semi-detached houses are built in a uniform row, the Council will insist that a minimum gap of 1 metre between the extension and the side boundary should be retained to prevent a cramped terracing effect.
5. The proposed two-storey side extension would be set 1 metre back from the front wall, with a corresponding lower roofline. Its hipped roof form and materials would match the host property. As such, the original form of the host property would remain intact and the extension would appear as a subordinate addition which would be in keeping with its character and appearance.

6. The two-storey side extension would be set in from the side boundary with No 29, but by less than 1 metre. No 29 has already been extended to the side, but only a single storey and is set in from the boundary. The separation distances involved, combined with a 1 metre set back, lower roof line, and the hipped roof form, would ensure that the extension would not appear cramped, and in turn, would avoid any actual and perceived terracing effect.
7. In coming to this view, I have also had regard to the presence of three other two-storey side extensions in the street, which I was able to see at my site visit.
8. The proposal also includes a single-storey rear extension, but there is nothing in the Council's refusal reason or officer report indicating that it is opposed to this element of the appeal scheme. From the information before me I have no reason to disagree with the Council on this matter.
9. Overall, whilst the proposed two-storey side extension does not fully accord with the advice in the SPD in terms of the distance to the side boundary, it is not the intention of such guidance to be strictly applied in all circumstances. I have necessarily considered the proposal on its own merits, and for the reasons outlined above, I have found that the proposal would be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the host property and would not be harmful to the Oakdale Road street scene.
10. I therefore conclude that the development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and as a result, complies with the broad design principles of Policies SC9, DS1 and DS3 of Bradford's Core Strategy 2017.

Conditions

11. As suggested by the Council I have imposed the standard commencement and approved plans conditions for certainty. A condition requiring the external materials to match the existing building is necessary to ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR