



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 May 2023

by D Hartley BA(Hons) MTP MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/23/3318431

41 Heath Hall Avenue, Bradford BD4 6JN

- 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 Ms Lai against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/04881/HOU, dated 14 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 12 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as a first-floor extension to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwellinghouse falling within an established housing estate. This part of Heath Hall Avenue is characterised by mainly semi-detached dwellinghouses in a linear form and constructed from brick. The properties are set back from the main road and include single storey front additions with pitched or mono-pitched roofs. The main roofs of the dwellinghouses are simple and remain generally unbroken. Overall, there is a pleasing consistency in terms of the appearance, scale and position of dwellinghouses and this adds positively and distinctively to the character of the street when appreciated by passers-by.
4. It is proposed to erect a first-floor extension over the existing single storey front addition of the dwellinghouse to create an enlarged third bedroom. Owing to its position and height, I find that it would cause material harm to the existing design symmetry that exists amongst the pair of semi-detached properties. Given the projection and scale of the first-floor extension, it would not appear subservient to the host property. This harm would be compounded because the proposed pitched roof would break what is currently a simple and contiguous unbroken roof across the pair of semi-detached properties.
5. Give the above, I find that when the proposal is judged in the context of the rest of the properties in this street, it would appear as a dominant and incongruous addition materially at odds with the design consistency that exists

in respect of the single storey front projections to the other dwellinghouses in the vicinity of the appeal site.

6. I acknowledge that similar developments do exist elsewhere in other parts of the housing estate such as at No. 50 Hambledon Avenue, Nos. 5, 8 14 Wrigley Avenue and No. 76 Bierley House Avenue. However, these extensions do not fall within Heath Hall Avenue and, furthermore, I do not know the exact circumstances which led these extensions being constructed.
7. I have determined this appeal in the context of the impact that the proposed development would have on the character and appearance of Heath Hall Avenue. In this regard, and notwithstanding the existence of a limited number of similar extensions elsewhere within the wider housing estate, I conclude that the proposed development would not constitute good design and would have a significantly detrimental impact on character and appearance of Heath Hall Avenue.
8. Furthermore, and, in any event, I do not find that the aforementioned examples of similar development elsewhere have fundamentally changed the character and appearance of the housing estate when considered as a whole. They are the exception rather than the norm and, hence, I do not share the view expressed by the appellant that such developments have set a planning precedent.
9. For the collective reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposal would not accord with the design, character and appearance requirements of policies DS1 and DS3 of the Council's Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2017, the Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document 2012 and chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the development would not accord with the development plan for the area taken as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

D Hartley

INSPECTOR