



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 July 2024

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/24/3344766

14 Bradford Old Road, Cottingley, Bingley BD16 1PF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Miss Nargas Begum against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00495/HOU.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension (above existing ground floor extension), re-build gable end, dormer windows to rear and rooflights to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the description of development that is common to the Council's decision notice and the appeal form as this is more concise than the description provided on the application form.
3. The Council has highlighted a discrepancy between the submitted floor plans and elevations. However, as the appeal is being dismissed, it has not been necessary to seek further clarification on this matter.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - i) the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area;
 - ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of 1 Roundhill Mount, with particular regard to outlook and overshadowing.

Reasons

Character and appearance

5. The appeal property is one half of a pair of hipped-roof, semi-detached houses located in an established residential area.
6. The appellant claims that the building is already unbalanced as a result of the existing side extension. However, the existing extension has not altered the original hipped roof design of the building. Thus, whilst there has been some effect on the symmetry in the pair, the overall sense of balance and core shape of the building is retained.

7. In contrast, the proposed hip-to-gable alteration and first floor side extension would fundamentally alter the core shape of the building and cause it to appear far more unbalanced when viewed from the street. The set back from the front elevation and lower ridge line of the extension would do little to assist in this regard. Consequently, this element of the proposal would seriously harm the character and appearance of the host building and the street scene in which it is situated.
8. The proposal also includes two flat roof dormer windows at the rear. These would be set in from the edges of the roof and apart from each other. Despite this, they would be wide and bulky features, and taken together, would occupy a large proportion of the extended rear roofslope. Their presence would be further heightened by the use of a contrasting cladding material. As a result, the dormers would be unduly dominant and unsympathetic additions to the building. That said, public views of the dormers would only be glimpsed and in a context of other dormers of various shapes and sizes. The effect on the wider surrounding area would therefore be more limited in this regard.
9. Considering the scheme as a whole, I find that the proposal would not constitute well-designed and sympathetic additions to the host building and street scene. As such, there is conflict with Policies DS1 and DS3 of Bradford's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017) (the CS), which among other things, require that development is well designed and should make a positive contribution to the streetscape and the character of the area in which it is situated. In addition, despite compliance with the Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in some respects, there is conflict with the overarching aim of Design Principle 1, which states 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.

Living conditions

10. The side of the appeal property faces the rear of 1 Roundhill Mount, which lies to the north and at a lower level. The rear elevation of 1 Roundhill Mount contains a number of habitable windows at ground and first floor level, while the rear garden is short in length and contains a small prefabricated garage and driveway along the common boundary.
11. The appellant refers to the impact of the existing side extension. However, the existing extension has a relatively modest eaves height and the roof slopes away from the boundary. Clearly, the intention of the design was to reduce its scale and massing along the boundary, taking account of the difference in ground levels and close physical relationship of the properties.
12. The proposed first floor side extension would be appreciably taller, with its gable wall now extending well above the upper floor rear windows of 1 Roundhill Mount. This would cause the extension to appear inescapably dominant and overbearing from the rear windows and garden of 1 Roundhill Mount.
13. Furthermore, as the proposed first floor side extension would lie directly to the south of 1 Roundhill Mount, it would likely cause additional overshadowing of this neighbour's rear garden at certain times, to the further detriment of the enjoyment of this outdoor space.

14. I therefore find that the proposed first floor side extension would unacceptably harm the living conditions of the occupiers of 1 Roundhill Mount in terms of outlook and overshadowing. As such, there is conflict with Policy DS5 of the CS where it seeks to protect the amenity of existing residents. There is also conflict with Design Principle 3 of the SPD, which states that extensions should not over dominate, seriously damage outlook or unacceptably reduce natural daylight reaching any neighbour's property.

Other Matters

15. Any benefits the proposal may bring in terms of improved internal living accommodation at the appeal property would not justify or outweigh the harm that would be caused and the resultant conflict that arises with the development plan as a whole.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR