



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2022

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 JANUARY 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/21/3283441

18 Tannerbrook Close, Clayton, Bradford BD14 6NJ

- 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 D McNally against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02780/HOU, dated 19 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is porch to front and chimney breast to side of house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my site visit the proposed porch extension and chimney breast appeared to have been substantially completed. I have therefore considered the appeal on the basis that the proposal is part retrospective.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - the character and appearance of the host property and street scene; and
 - highway safety, with particular regard to parking provision.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site comprises an extended two-storey detached house situated on a corner plot within the relatively modern residential cul-de-sac estate of Tannerbrook Close. The houses in the estate are constructed in either light or dark coloured bricks at ground floor level with render above and a dark concrete roof tile. The appeal property is in the lighter brick type. Although open porches and bay windows are a characteristic feature of the front elevations, these are typically small in scale and do not protrude significantly forward towards the road.
5. In contrast, the appeal porch extension is a wide and bulky structure that projects out considerably from the front elevation, while also awkwardly overlapping with the two-storey side extension. In addition, it is constructed in darker bricks and bright red roof tiles which do not match those used in the rest of this house. It has been put to me that the use of non-matching materials is innovative and compliments the property, but in my judgement it

has a jarring effect and adds further to the discordant and unsympathetic appearance of the extension. Thus, despite representing a relatively modest increase in floorspace terms, I find that the porch extension has a pronounced and entirely unsatisfactory effect upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and the street scene.

6. The chimney breast is located on the side elevation, which abuts the highway. As a result, it is prominent in view from that part of Tannerbrook Close. Again, the dark bricks used in the construction of the chimney breast do not match the rest of the house, which makes it even more conspicuous. Furthermore, as a result of its tight siting between the two ground floor bay windows, the lower section of the chimney breast appears uncomfortably cramped on this elevation. Consequently, the chimney breast is an unsatisfactory addition to the appeal property and has harmed its appearance.
7. In reasoning the above I have had regard to the Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (the SPD). The SPD advises that front extensions, including porches, as well as the use of non-matching or deliberately contrasting materials, may be appropriate in some circumstances. Nonetheless, the SPD also states that the size, position and form of extensions should maintain or improve the character and quality of the original house and wider area, and also that the acceptability of contrasting materials will depend on the overall quality of the design and how it looks in context.
8. I conclude, on this issue, that the development significantly harms the character and appearance of the host property and street scene. This is contrary to Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017) (the CS), as well as the SPD, which among other things, require that development is well designed and should make a positive contribution to the streetscape and the character of the area in which it is situated.

Parking

9. The porch extension has resulted in the loss of the off-street parking provision at the front of the property. The proposal seeks to compensate for this through provision of a parking space within the rear garden.
10. According to the appellant, there is approximately 2.5m-2.6m of width available to access the parking space. However, this is not clearly demonstrated on the plans, particularly as the projection of the bay windows is not shown. Moreover, during my inspection I noted a further significant impediment to access in the form of a street lighting column that does not appear to have been accounted for. Therefore, on the evidence before me, and my own observations, I am not persuaded that the proposed parking space is practically achievable. As such, it is not necessary for me to go on to consider the further concerns raised by the Council in relation to any associated reversing manoeuvres.
11. The implications of the above are that the appeal property, a large family home, would be without any off-street parking provision. This is contrary to the Council's parking standards, which require an average of 1.5 spaces per unit. Furthermore, I observed that there are very few, if any, opportunities within this small estate to accommodate the displaced parking without being obstructive to other road users, particularly in the immediate vicinity of the

appeal site where the parking is most likely to take place. Therefore, notwithstanding that Tannerbrook Close is a relatively quiet cul-de-sac with only a handful of dwellings, the displaced parking is likely to result in long term highway conditions that may pose an unacceptable risk to the safety of highway users and the safe and efficient operation of the highway in this location.

12. I conclude, on this issue, that the development has unacceptably harmful implications for highway safety by reason of inadequate parking provision. This is contrary to CS Policies DS4 and TR2, which among other things, require that parking is integrated in the development, creates a safe environment, and be provided in accordance with the current parking standards.

Conclusion

13. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, that outweigh this conflict. Therefore, for the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR