



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2023

by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/22/3306538

13 Bellhouse Crescent, Bradford BD4 6AJ

- 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 M Khan against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/02677/HOU, dated 16 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is construction of single storey side extension (retrospective) and wall height increase.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Of the proposed works, the side extension is in situ. I am therefore dealing with the appeal, in part, retrospectively.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Bellhouse Crescent is a residential street characterised by predominantly semi-detached properties. The appeal property differs from the predominant house type and is a large, detached dwelling which both in its size, materials and appearance differ from the others in the street.
5. The property has been extended in the past but maintains a general cohesiveness to its form and appearance. Contemporary design, can, in some circumstances, be an appropriate approach to an extension or alteration of a building. However, in this case, the development overtly clashes and contrasts with the vernacular style of the existing house. It extends a significant length from the property and although single storey, its substantial length projecting to the side, is at odds with the host dwelling's plan form. This clash is exacerbated by the materials, which draw the eye in the street scene despite the extension being set back significantly from the front façade.
6. The existing wall is prominent and distinct from the front boundary treatments of others in the street, which are characterised by lower walls, high fencing, planting, or a combination. The straight alignment and length of the wall results in a prominent feature adjacent to the footway. The increase in height,

albeit by a small amount, would result in an overly dominant feature in this part of the street.

7. The location of the property at the end of Bellhouse Crescent assists in moderating the effects in the wider street scene. Nonetheless, the development is clearly visible from the front along the street and where the access to the footpath is achieved. This is not sufficient therefore to overcome my concerns.
8. I therefore conclude that the development has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The development therefore conflicts with the requirements of Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Council's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017) and its Householder Supplementary Planning Document taken together. These stipulate, amongst other things, that development proposals should create a strong sense of place and be appropriate to their context in terms of layout, scale, density, details and materials.
9. The increase in wall height would improve the privacy of the garden. However, it has not been demonstrated that this is the only way to achieve privacy, moderating the weight I give to this benefit.
10. For the reasons given above, the development conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations that outweigh this conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR