
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 December 2021

by Patrick Hanna MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/21/3281939

14 Canford Drive, Bradford BD15 7AU

- 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 Nanje Ngogwe against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02339/HOU, dated 2 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey rear and side extension, including conversion of existing garage into habitable living area; the creation of a covered front entrance porch; hip to gable conversion raising the ridge height creating habitable living area in the roof space incorporating a single rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area and the living conditions of the occupants of No 16 Canford Drive.

Procedural matter

3. The appellant refers to amended drawings. However, these were not assessed by the Council and have not been subject to consultation. I have therefore determined the appeal on the application drawings.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal dwelling is a two-storey detached dwelling located in a residential area characterised by mixed housing designs with predominantly hipped roof ends. Canford Drive rises to the north and west, and dwellings along it have stepped ground and roof levels. The effect of the proposal would be to add hipped roof ends and increase the ridge height of the dwelling, thereby creating a larger roof form of greater height than the adjacent lower dwelling.
5. The proposal would increase the appeal dwelling roof height by some 1.425 metres, potentially more¹. Given the rising levels along the street, the proposed roof would be substantially higher than the roof at the adjacent lower dwelling at No 12 Canford Drive. The change in roof levels would contrast sharply with the modest steps in height elsewhere along the street. This

¹ Drawing no. 5000/210-PL-B shows the 1.425 metre measurement taken from different positions.

contrasting effect would be further emphasised by the proposed alteration from hipped roof ends to gable ends, which would increase the volume of the roof and result in a roof with an overall massing and form markedly different from most other roofs in the vicinity.

6. Gabled roof ends do exist elsewhere, with Nos 22, 34, 36 and 40 Canford Drive given as examples. However, they are not a particularly prevalent feature in the street scene and none appear to have the raised roof height that is proposed in the current appeal. As such, these cited precedents can be distinguished from the proposed development.
7. The proposed box dormers would occupy a substantial proportion of the rear roof plane and have very limited roof margins. Consequently, the sides of the dormers would be readily visible from the street and would add to the effect of an overlarge roof form. Taking the proposed roof height, gabled roof ends and box dormers together, the proposal would be overlarge, dominant, and incongruous in the street scene.
8. The gap between a side extension and boundary is recommended by the Bradford Householder Supplementary Planning Document (2012)(SPD) to be a minimum of one metre, in order to avoid cramped terracing effects. The proposed gap at the appeal site fails to achieve this, although the total gap between the proposed side extension and the adjacent side extension at No 16 is indicated by the appellant to be some 1.8 metres.
9. Several factors would prevent such a terracing effect in this case; there is an existing change in ground and roof levels between the properties, and the existing side hipped roof arrangement at No 16 clearly defines a detached building form, such that the total gap between both properties would be clearly evident. Taken together, these factors ensure that the two properties would remain visually separate and distinct from each other. As a consequence, there would be no significant terracing effect.
10. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. As a whole, the proposal conflicts with policies DS1, DS3 and SC9 of the Bradford District Core Strategy (2017)(CS) and the SPD. Together these policies and guidance require that new development should make great places and achieve good design by responding to their context.

Living conditions

11. The fourth reason for refusal states that it has not been demonstrated that the proposal does not project beyond the 45 degree line from the nearest habitable window at No 16. However, a single storey extension has been erected at No 16 that projects beyond the appeal proposal, and at first floor level the rear walls would approximately align. As such the proposal would not damage outlook or unacceptably reduce light. The proposal would not have a significant adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupants of No 16. In this respect, the proposal accords with policy DS5 of the CS and the SPD, which together require development to not harm the amenity of existing residents.

Conclusion

12. I have found that the proposed development would not adversely affect the living conditions of neighbouring properties. However, this is outweighed by the

harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area by the proposed increase in height, introduction of gabled roof ends, and overlarge dormers. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Patrick Hanna

INSPECTOR