
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 April 2022

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/22/3292993

11 Springfield Gardens, Keighley BD20 6JU

- 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 Khurshid Munir against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/05744/HOU, dated 12 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing garage and erection of double-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing garage and erection of double-storey side extension at 11 Springfield Gardens, Keighley BD20 6JU in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/05744/HOU dated 12 November 2021 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: J21015-01, J2105-02, J2105-03C & J21015-04C.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposal has been altered slightly from the application form to the decision notice. That on the application form, however, adequately describes the proposal and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The dwelling to which the application relates along with its neighbour form a pair of semi-detached dwellings which sit at the head of a cul-de-sac within a residential area.
5. Although there is a certain level of uniformity within the design of many of the dwellings within the street, there is variation in scale and design given that some properties include three floors with a garage at ground floor level.

6. Variations to window detailing and cladding materials to the front dormer windows are evident. Further, a property towards the mouth of the street breaks from the established design and includes a prominent front facing gabled roof.
7. Within this context, the introduction of a pitched roof dormer to the front roof slope of the extended dwelling would not harm its appearance. This would particularly be the case given that it would be set at the same height as the existing front dormer window up from the eaves and would incorporate a window opening of similar design and scale to those existing. It would also incorporate vertical roof tiling and painted timber fascia to match the existing dormer.
8. Section 3:6. of the SPD¹ guidance relates specifically to dormer windows and roof extensions. It states that 'if there are many within the street it might be desirable for new dormers to be of the same size, position with the roof and detailing'. Given the use of the word 'might' the guidance does appear to offer scope for an alternative design and there is nothing to suggest that there is a requirement to automatically follow the established pattern of box/flat roof dormers.
9. Although the extension would not be set back from the main front elevation of the dwelling, it would be set back behind the deep eaves on the property which are in evidence above the front door and front window. The ridgeline on the side extension would be set down from the existing ridgeline and the two-storey rear element would again be set down from the extension. These design features would ensure that the extension would be subservient to the host dwelling.
10. The stepped nature of the extension would not be especially notable from within the cul-de-sac and while necessitated by the width of the plot, it would help reduce the bulk of the extension when viewed from the street. The two-storey rear element would have very limited visibility from the street, would be partially screened from other properties as a result of some robust hedging along the boundaries and would be in proportion with what is an unexpectedly large rear garden, such that it would be in keeping with the proportions of the plot.
11. Subsequently, the proposal would accord with policies DS1 and DS3 of the Core Strategy (2017) (CS) which amongst other things require proposals which achieve good design and which are appropriate to their context in terms of layout, scale, density, details and materials. Further, I have not found conflict with SPD guidance.
12. I have not found conflict with policies DS2, DS4, DS5 or SC9 of the CS which relate respectively to working with the landscape, streets and movement, safe and inclusive places and making great places.

Conditions

13. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three-year time limit. It is necessary that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. A

¹ Local Development Framework for Bradford – Householder Supplementary Planning Document.

condition requiring matching materials is not necessary given that materials, which would broadly match those existing, are specified on the plans.

Conclusion

14. Taking all relevant matters into account, the proposal accords with the development plan and there is no indication that a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore allowed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR