



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 March 2022

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/22/3291949

86 Cheltenham Road, Bradford BD2 1QQ

- 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 Mrs Mairead Farndale against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/05709/HOU, dated 2 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as retrospective front bay window with front entrance cladding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The application was submitted retrospectively and I have considered the appeal on that basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on i) the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area; and ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of 88 Cheltenham Road with particular regard to privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The houses along this part of Cheltenham Road comprise regular terraced blocks set perpendicular to the road. They are distinctive for their uniform design, materials and unaltered frontages.
5. As the only example of a forward extension among these houses, the appeal development is highly conspicuous and markedly out of keeping with the established character. The external cladding treatment adds further to the incongruity of the development, particularly as such materials are otherwise only found at first floor level.
6. Thus, despite its relatively modest projection, I find that the development has a pronounced and entirely unsatisfactory effect upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and its surroundings. This is contrary to Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017) (the CS), 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. It is also contrary to the Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (the SPD), which advises against front extensions where the uniform appearance of an area or street is a distinctive characteristic.

Living conditions

7. The development is constructed along the boundary with No 88 and contains a clear glazed window in the side elevation. It is very likely that this window allows views into the front living room window of No 88, with a resultant loss of privacy for those neighbouring occupiers. I noted the use of blinds in the window, but this could not always be guaranteed.
8. I therefore find that the development has a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 88 Cheltenham Road through loss of privacy. This is contrary to Policy DS5 of the CS, and the SPD, insofar as they seek to protect the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Other Matters

9. In reasoning the above, I have taken into account the letter of support from a local Councillor and the absence of any objection from the neighbours. However, these are not considerations which justify the harmful effects of the development, so do not lead me to a different conclusion.

Conclusion

10. Given the above, the proposal would not accord with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no considerations that outweigh this finding. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR