



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 August 2022

by H Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15th August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/22/3299054

2 Providence Crescent, Oakworth, Keighley BD22 7QT

- 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 Craig Baines against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00789/HOU, dated 18 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is a double-storey side extension to form; garage, utility room, additional bedroom and extension to an existing bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a double-storey side extension to form; garage, utility room, additional bedroom and extension to an existing bedroom at 2 Providence Crescent, Oakworth, Keighley BD22 7QT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/00789/HOU, dated 18 February 2022, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: J20038-04A and J20038-03B.
 - 3) Notwithstanding any details shown on the approved plans, the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.

Reasons

3. 2 Providence Crescent is a semi-detached house located within a residential area. Providence Crescent contains a mix of house types with a range of external materials. There is, nevertheless, a number of distinctive design elements which creates a cohesion to the development and sets it apart from neighbouring streets. No 2 and the adjoining house exhibit some of those distinguishing features. Each property features a form of render finish with some stonework, bay windows and a prominence to the soffit, fascia and barge board appearance. Though a number of properties on Providence Crescent

have been extended, the designs vary and as a result there is not a clearly established approach in this regard.

4. Where the proposed extension would adjoin the house no set back of the front elevation is proposed. A set back is one of the recommendations contained within Bradford's Householder Supplementary Planning Document (SDP) where it provides advice on achieving well designed two storey extensions. The SPD is clear, however, that a strict application of the design guidance within it is not appropriate in all circumstances.
5. The roof ridge of the proposed extension would step down from that of the main house. The extension would not be wide and would remain a proportionate addition to the house. The bay window adds variation to the front elevation and its retention would serve to break down the mass of the widened property when viewed from the street. Therefore, despite the flush nature of the extension, these factors would combine to ensure that it would appear subservient to the host the property rather than dominant.
6. Further pairs of similarly designed semi-detached properties are to one side and opposite the host property. These are each set back from the highway at comparable distances and this does provide a degree of uniformity to this group of houses. However, a short distance farther along the street, the highway curves noticeably and houses are more staggered in their address of the street. The property next door to No 2 on the corner is differently positioned with its side elevation addressing Providence Crescent. A garden area is between the properties which forms a quite considerable gap. On the opposite side of Providence Crescent to No 2, and a little farther along the street, are a row of dormer bungalows whose appearance is quite different from the host property. There is variety in the street scene therefore, and I find that the absence of a front elevation recess to the proposed extension would not disrupt the architectural rhythm of the street nor create an incongruous feature.
7. The adjoining semi-detached property has a flush single storey side extension with a lean-to roof. Given this is quite different from the dual pitched two storey side extension proposed, the two properties would not appear symmetrical irrespective of whether or not this proposal incorporated a flush or recessed elevation. The incorporation of the flush elevation does reflect that aspect of the extension next door.
8. I acknowledge that the design of an extension previously granted planning permission incorporated a recessed front elevation. However, for the reasons given, I find the alternative proposal subject to this appeal acceptable in design terms on its own merits.
9. Accordingly, I find that the development would not harm the character and appearance of either the host property or the street scene and would therefore be in accordance with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the City of Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2017. These policies, amongst other things, require that high quality places are achieved through an understanding of the site and that the layout, scale, detail and materiality of the design proposed is appropriate. I have had regard to the design advice contained within the SPD, but for the reasons given, find that the development represents good design which in turn accords with the overall aims of the SPD.

Conditions

10. I have imposed a plans condition in the interests of clarity. To protect the character and appearance of the area, I have imposed a condition to secure appropriate use of materials.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed subject to the conditions above.

H Jones

INSPECTOR