



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 July 2022

**by F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 21 July 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/22/3298024**

**1511 Thornton Road, Bradford, BD13 3AS**

- 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 N Begum against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
  - The application Ref 22/00011/HOU, dated 28 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 February 2022.
  - The development proposed is described as the retention of side extension and front and rear dormers.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Preliminary Matters

2. From my site visit I saw that development is underway and is substantially complete. One of the Local Planning Authority's reasons for refusal relates to inconsistencies with the submitted plans and what has been built. The appellant's statement of case appears to focus on the scheme as built, and I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

4. The appeal property, and the immediate neighbouring properties are hipped roof bungalows with a projecting pitched roof gable feature. There are a mix of property types of varying design in the wider area, with a number of extensions and alterations. Nevertheless, the clear spaces in-between properties and the shape of the buildings creates an open character that contributes to a sense of place.
5. The side extension has been constructed using matching materials. There remains a gap to the neighbouring property, and it has been set back from the existing porch which provides some articulation. However, the side extension has not been set back from the primary elevation and the eaves and ridge line run through to a gable end, in contrast with the hipped roof of the attached neighbouring property. Unlike another nearby example, where the hipped roof has been replaced by a gable without the addition of a side extension, the extended wall, eaves and ridge creates a bulky extension that significantly unbalances the pair of semi-detached houses. The side extension has been

constructed to appear as an 'integrated design' as part of the original house, but nevertheless, combined with the gable end it reduces the space around the property and creates a dominant development.

6. Two large dormers have been added to the front, finished with similar materials to the roof. While set down from the ridge line, and up from the front elevation with some separation between them and the side, their large scale and positioning across the existing roof and the extension dominates the roof. They further unbalance the semi-detached properties and do not relate positively to the open character of the area.
7. I understand that permission has previously been granted for extensions to the dwelling. However, the location of the dormers was different and the side extension set back. As such, the current proposal would have a greater presence and be more unbalancing. For the reasons given, this proposal adversely affects the character and appearance of the area. This is in conflict with Policy DS1 and DS3 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017) which, amongst other things, seek development that contributes to good design and high quality places, being informed by a good understanding of the site, area and its context and create a strong sense of place. Even if I had determined the appeal based on the submitted plans and not what I saw has been built, the effects arising would have been the same as the main differences do not appear to relate to the form and shape of the development.

### **Conclusion**

8. My above findings bring the development into conflict with the development plan, read as a whole. There are no material considerations that have been shown to have sufficient weight to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

*F Harrison*

INSPECTOR