



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: 23rd January 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/22/3310749

61 Norman Avenue, Bradford BD2 2ND

- 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 Mohammad Sharif against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/03204/HOU, dated 21 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is proposed raise of roof to add a floor above with double storey front and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposal on:
 - The character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
 - The living conditions of the occupiers of No 63 Norman Avenue (No 63) with particular reference to outlook and sunlight.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property, and the adjacent property No 63, are detached bungalows in a street that is characterised by predominantly two-storey dwellings. The proposed extension would result in a detached two-storey dwelling, leaving No 63 appearing squeezed in between two two-storey houses. This would be exacerbated by the narrowness of the plot of No 63 and the forward projection of the proposed development. As a result, No 63 would appear unduly hemmed in by the buildings either side in the street scene.
4. The appeal site is positioned adjacent to the junction with Acre Grove (the Grove) and the house on the opposite side of the corner of the Grove (No 57) has a similar sized plot both of which are distinctly larger in size than most of the other plots along this part of Norman Avenue. No 57 is a large detached two-storey dwelling. In this regard, the scale, of the resulting proposal would harmonise with the scale of No 57 and indeed the height of most of the other two-storey dwellings in the street.
5. Given this distinction in the street scene a departure in the form, materials, and fenestration from the prevailing appearance of the other houses in the street would not, in isolation, be harmful to the character and appearance of

the area. However, this or the acceptability of other parts of the scheme, such as the replacement garage do not outweigh my concerns regarding the scale of the proposal and the subsequent effects on the appearance of No 63 in the street scene. This is, in my view, overriding.

6. I therefore find that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore conflict with the requirements of Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Council's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017) (CS), its Householder Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework. Taken together these, amongst other things, are concerned with the character and appearance of developments.

Living conditions - No 63

7. No 63 has windows to the side elevation that face toward the appeal property and the boundary. Moreover, it has a small garden and both properties are set close to the common boundary. The combined additional bulk and massing of the two-storey element would be an imposing feature where seen over the boundary. This dominance would create an unduly hemmed in feeling and sense of enclosure.
8. The additional bulk and massing of the proposed built form would be to the north of No 63. As such, given the orientation of the sun relative to the appeal property and No 63 there would be no significant overshadowing from the proposal or loss of sunlight.
9. I therefore find that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 63 with particular reference to outlook. The proposal would therefore conflict with the requirements of Policy DS5 of the CS and the SPD, which amongst other things, seeks development that does not harm the amenity of existing residents.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has made changes to their scheme, following the refusal of an earlier application with a view to finding a solution. However, this is not a matter for my consideration in this appeal and I am only able to make my decision considering the plans that were before the Council when it made its decision.
11. Extending the property would meet the appellant's need for increased accommodation, would help renovate the property and would be built to modern standards. However, these are not considerations that outweigh the harm that I have identified in the main issues.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR