



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2022

by L Hughes, BA (Hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/22/3302468

18 Pullan Avenue, Bradford, BD2 3RT

- 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 Muhammad Imran against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01358/HOU, dated 23 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 18 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is a ground floor alteration/first floor extension and roof conversion with dormers, proposed outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council raises no objection to the front dormer, the ground floor infill alteration, or the outbuilding, so I have focused my decision on the first floor extension and the roof conversion with the rear dormer.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The subject property comprises a semi-detached dwelling, set within a residential street of predominantly semi-detached dwellings. It forms part of a small stretch of 3 pairs with a unique design compared to other nearby pairings. This is because they are asymmetrical, with differing roof planes and bay projections at ground and first floors, but still read as a balanced and attractive matched pair overall. To the rear the property has an additional lower ground level due to the drop in the level of the land.
5. While the row of 3 pairs includes single storey side extensions, and nearby dwellings also benefit from some extensions and alterations, the character and regularity of the original dwellings within the streetscene generally remains intact, which is a positive feature. Pullan Avenue is particularly wide which creates a long and broad vista with clear views of the dwellings.

6. The 2 storey side extension incorporating a hip to gable alteration would have a contiguous roofline with that of the original dwelling, and no ground floor set back from the front of the house. This would not display sufficient subordination or complement the design of the original property such that it would over-dominate its original character. This would also unbalance the cohesive character of the 2 dwellings when viewed as an integral pair and thus harm the general uniformity of the set of 3 pairs. It would contribute to unacceptable massing when viewed in the wider streetscene context.
7. The rear dormer would cover a large part of the roof plane, and would be over-dominant and unsympathetic due to this design and its scale and massing.
8. While the appellant notes that there are no properties directly to the rear due to the long garden, the changes to the roof would be seen from other gardens and windows of nearby properties. Notwithstanding this, there is also an intrinsic need for an extension to be appropriate to its host.
9. In conclusion therefore, the development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. This would be contrary to Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017). These policies aim for proposals to achieve good design, and to ensure that new developments are appropriate to their context, specifically in relation to scale, and in responding to the existing positive patterns of development which contribute to the character of the area.
10. The development would also be contrary to guidance in the Bradford Householder Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), specifically that the size, position and form of extensions and dormer windows should maintain or improve the character and quality of the original house and wider area.

Other Matters

11. The appellant states that they have a right to extend their house to provide better living standards, and also that changes to the proposal result from advice on a previously refused application. However, these matters do not mitigate the harm which would be caused by the proposal as outlined above.

Conclusion

12. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole. With no other material considerations outweighing this conflict, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Hughes

INSPECTOR