



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 May 2022

by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/22/3294705

2 Canford Drive, Bradford BD15 7AR

- 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 Nasir Amin against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/05823/HOU, dated 16 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as "retrospective planning application to proposed double storey side and rear extension with rear dormer window".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. At the time of my site visit, the extensions appeared to be mostly completed. I have assessed the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the extensions on the character and appearance of the appeal property and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The area surrounding the appeal site is characterised predominantly by semi-detached residential properties of traditional architectural design and detailing. The built development in the area is uniformed with the roofs of properties being of simple form. It is this traditional and simple built form that contributes positively to the character of the area.
5. The extensions appear as incongruous structures given their overall size, lack of significant set back from the principal elevation and the awkward roof arrangement with a hipped style roof up against a gable style roof. Due to the design, scale and roof form of the extensions, they are discordant features that have a detrimental effect on the appeal property and adversely affects the appearance of the surrounding area.
6. Accordingly, the extensions have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property and surrounding area. The proposal contradicts Policies DS1 and DS3 of the City of Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2017 and the City of Bradford Supplementary Planning Document which seeks proposals to achieve good design and respond to existing positive patterns of development.

7. I have had regard to the previous application however, these schemes are not directly comparable as the roof forms differ and the previous scheme has the extension set back from the principal elevation. Insufficient information has been provided with regards to levels and why the previous scheme could not be built. These matters do not alter my findings above.

Conclusion

8. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, which outweigh this finding.
9. Therefore, for the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR