
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2022

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/22/3297507

1 Folkestone Street, Bradford BD3 9NX

- 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 Aqsa Manzoor against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/06044/HOU, dated 2 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is proposed first floor side and rear extension with front and rear dormer window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for proposed first floor side and rear extension with front and rear dormer window at 1 Folkestone Street, Bradford BD3 9NX in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 21/06044/HOU dated 2 December 2021 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) 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.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 21-109-P-01, 21-109-P-04 (Street Sections) & 21-109-P-04 (Existing and Proposed Plans with Site Plan).

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the proposal has been altered from the application form to the decision notice. That on the application form adequately describes the proposal although I have omitted wording that is not a description of development. I acknowledge that the proposal includes a hip to gable roof extension.
3. At the time of the site visit, I noted that the hip to gable roof conversion had been carried out and that the front and rear dormer windows were under construction. Works that had been carried out appeared broadly in accordance with the plans before me, but for the avoidance of doubt my consideration has been made against the plans.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to the proposed set back from the front elevation and splayed wall and roof form on the side extension.

Reasons

5. The extension would not incorporate any substantial set back at ground floor level. However, this merely reflects the existing situation at the site where the front elevation of the existing single storey side extension sits closely to the main front elevation of the house.
6. The side extension would incorporate a substantial set back from the main front elevation at first floor level and the ridgeline of the extension would sit below that on the main dwelling.
7. The side extension would utilise the same splayed building line to the western side of the dwelling as currently utilised by the single storey side extension and given the falling land levels on Curzon Road, the existing extension already forms a prominent, well-established feature within the street-scene.
8. Taking account of the existing arrangement at the site, and the design features of the extension, the proposal would be subordinate to the existing dwelling and would not significantly imbalance the pair of semi-detached properties such that it would have an adverse impact on their appearance. The proposal would not appear visually incongruous and would not therefore harm the character and appearance of the area.
9. 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, and details.
10. In relation to extensions to the side of a house the SPD¹ suggests that two storey extensions will normally require a 1 metre set back behind the front wall of a house. However, the use of the word normally suggests that this may not be required on all occasions and I therefore do not find conflict with SPD guidance.

Conditions

11. The standard commencement condition should not be imposed given that the works appear to have commenced. 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 condition requiring matching materials is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

12. 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

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