



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2022

by Diane Cragg Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/22/3290360

6 Wooller Road, Low Moor, Bradford BD12 0RR

- 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 Ria Singh against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/05209/FUL, dated 20 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 16 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'convert the basement of No 6 to form self-contained bedsit. The upper part of No 6 is already split from the basement so no works are required'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. An amended proposed basement plan dated 8 January 2022 was submitted as part of the appeal. While this amended drawing was not considered by the Council at application stage, the Council has had the opportunity to comment on it. I have therefore taken the amendments into consideration.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the development on (i) the living conditions of the future occupiers of the proposed development with regard to light, ventilation, outlook, and outdoor space and the living conditions of existing residents of No 6 Wooller Road with regard to outdoor space, and (ii) highway safety.

Reasons

Living conditions

4. No 6 Wooller Road is a stone-built terraced property set back from the New Works Road frontage in a mixed-use area. The property is single aspect with a separate building attached to the rear. No 6 is flanked to one side by The Royal public house and to the other by a residential property. The appeal site is the basement area of No 6. The basement entrance to the proposed bedsit is via steps down from the small front garden directly into the living space. The small garden is fenced to the side boundaries and faces the public house car park.
5. The proposal indicates that a small window would provide light and ventilation to the whole of the living accommodation. In the amended scheme the kitchen area would be opened-up to provide a single living space. The bathroom would

- have a means of extraction but no natural light or ventilation. The proposed internal space would be below the nationally described space standards.
6. The appeal property faces north so that light into the basement would be limited. Even if the door was changed to provide a larger area of glass, in addition to the northerly aspect of the site, the high fencing to either side of the small garden, and the change in land level outside the window and door, would still limit light into the internal space and provide a poor outlook. Further, the only natural ventilation would be via the small top hung casement window and the likely effect of the limited ventilation would be inadequate air circulation, with a higher risk of poor air quality and damp.
 7. Therefore, because of the restricted light into the basement area, lack of outlook and limited natural ventilation, the living space would be unacceptably compromised and the living conditions for its future occupants would be unsatisfactory.
 8. The use of the limited garden for car parking would result in practically no external amenity area for existing or future residents. The lack of external space would be detrimental to existing and future residents. The amended plan proposes that the parking space would instead be used for outside seating and to store waste bins for the proposed bedsit. Although the space would be small it would be sufficient, together with the proposed cycle storage, to provide for the requirements of the basement accommodation.
 9. Nevertheless, the existing accommodation within No 6 would retain limited outside space consisting of the entrance pathway into the house. Whilst this entrance way may be sufficient to accommodate bin storage it does not provide any privacy or the opportunity to store bicycles, provide an outside sitting area or an area for drying clothes.
 10. Consequently, the introduction of an additional and separate household into the basement would unacceptably intensify the use of the property. It would compromise the level of external space available to the existing resident/s of No 6 Wooller Road and would be detrimental to their living conditions with regard to provision of outdoor space.
 11. Overall, the proposed development would not provide satisfactory living conditions for its future occupants and would be detrimental to the living conditions of the existing resident/s of No 6 Wooller Road. The proposal would conflict with Policies DS5 and HO9 of the Bradford District Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Core Strategy) which, among other things, seeks to ensure that new development is well laid out and rooms receive adequate daylight.
 12. The development would also conflict with the Homes and Neighbourhoods: A Guide to Designing in Bradford Supplementary Planning Document February 2020, where it seeks to ensure that proposals demonstrate that accommodation is functional, adaptable, and liveable, is dual aspect, optimises natural light and has direct sunlight in to at least one living space.

Highway safety

13. Policy DS4 of the Core Strategy states that proposals should take opportunities to encourage people to walk, cycle and use public transport and Policy TR2 sets

out a number of strategies to manage car parking to help regulate travel demand and support the use of sustainable travel modes.

14. Although the Council indicates that Wooller Road is not in an accessible location, it seems to me that there are certain services and facilities within close proximity of the appeal site, including access to job opportunities at the nearby commercial premises. Also, I saw at my site visit that there are bus stops and Low Moor Railway Station within a reasonable walking distance of the appeal property.
15. No 6 has no parking facilities. Outside the site there is an unmade road and parking in the front garden of No 6 would likely impede access to other properties within the terraced row. The amended plan removes the proposed parking space leaving the proposed development with no parking provision. However, there is parking available along New Works Road and there is no substantive evidence before me that utilising roadside parking along this frontage would lead to highway safety concerns. My assessment also recognises that the development is for a small dwelling where parking demand would be limited.
16. Overall, the proposal would not lead to highway safety concerns and in this respect the development would accord with Policies DS4, DS5 and TR2 of the Core Strategy where these policies seek to ensure design, movement, layout, and parking support the use of sustainable transport modes.

Other Matters

17. I appreciate that the Council refers to policies in its reasons for refusal and some appellants may not be familiar with the terminology used in these. However, the appellant's agent has indicated regular contact with the Council on such matters. I am satisfied that the appellant had access to an agent who could clearly explain the outcome of the planning process.
18. The Royal public house, a grade II listed building, is attached to the appeal property. Due to the limited external alterations the proposed use of the basement would not harm the setting of the listed building; its setting would be preserved.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

19. The Council states that there is an undersupply of housing in the Bradford area, but I have no evidence before me about the extent of any shortfall in deliverable housing sites. Nevertheless, because of the provisions of footnote 8, paragraph 11 d) ii. of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) should be applied. This means granting permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
20. The proposal would harm the living conditions of the existing and future occupiers of No 6 Wooller Road in conflict with the Framework, where it seeks to ensure that development creates places that promote health and well-being with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users. I attach significant weight to the identified harm.

21. An additional bedsit would make little difference to the overall supply of housing and the contribution of one extra household in an accessible location, to the local economy and social objectives would be small.
22. Even considering the Framework's objective of significantly boosting the supply of housing, the adverse impacts of the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
23. Overall, I conclude that the proposal conflicts with the development plan, and there are no material considerations, including the Framework, that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR