
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 February 2025

by **R Gravett BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/24/3355197

44 Pasture Rise, Bradford BD14 6LX

- 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 Mr & Mrs Omar Ahmed against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02723/HOU.
 - The development proposed is construction of two storey side & part single storey rear extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above has been taken from the planning application form, but I have corrected a minor typographical error, such that it refers to 'rear' extensions.
3. A two-storey extension to the side of 44 Pasture Rise is currently being constructed. It has been built to roof level and it was clear from my site visit that there are similarities to the appeal proposal before me, in that the extension has been built flush with the existing front wall of the host house. However, because of scaffolding to the front elevation, it was not possible to be certain that it is the appeal scheme that is being built. I have therefore dealt with this appeal on the proposed plans before me.
4. The issue raised in the Reason for Refusal is that the application does not comply with the guidance contained in the Householder Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD) and is contrary to policies DS1, DS3 and DS5 of the Local Plan for Bradford District: Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017) (LP). It is evident from the Officer Report that this conflict is considered by the Council to result in harm to visual amenity, and the appellant's case addresses this matter. The Main Issue below has therefore been framed in these terms.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed two-storey side extension on the character and appearance of the existing house, and its semi-detached pair.

Reasons

6. Number 44 Pasture Rise (No 44) is a two-storey semi-detached house sited on a generous plot at the head of Pasture Rise, a cul-de-sac of houses of a similar type and design, constructed in a yellow or red brick, or finished in a render.

7. A ground floor roof canopy extends the width of the front elevation of No 44 above an existing bay window and front porch. A side extension is proposed which, at ground floor, would be built flush with the existing front elevation of No 44, continuing the line of the roof canopy. In this regard, the appeal proposal is similar to a two-storey side extension to No 44 granted planning permission on appeal in May 2019 (APP/W4705/D/19/3222490) ('the previous appeal scheme'). However, at first floor, the proposed two-storey side extension differs. It is proposed to be built flush with the original front elevation of No 44 and would continue both the eaves and ridgeline of the hipped roof of its host, rather than being set behind the front elevation or stepped down from the roof.
8. The first design principle in the SPD is that the size, position and form of extensions should maintain or improve the character and quality of the original house and wider area. The SPD states that two storey side extensions should 'normally' be positioned behind the front wall of a house to help to: make an extension appear subordinate and preserve the original design of the house; avoid an awkward and unsightly junction between old and new wall and roof materials; and help reduce the loss of openness between buildings. The proposed two-storey side extension to No 44 would not achieve the 1m set back behind the front wall of the house, or a corresponding lowering of the roofline, normally required by the SPD guidance.
9. The proposed side extension would project just under two thirds of the width of the original house. Although the proposed roof would be hipped to reflect the existing form, continuing the height of the ridgeline over such a width would result in substantial massing at roof level. Further, despite extending the line of the existing ground floor roof canopy, the absence of any set back from the front elevation would mean that an appreciation of the original design of the house is lost.
10. No 44 is sited at an angle on a generous plot so the proposed side extension would not interfere with any street scene symmetry, nor would it result in the loss of openness between buildings. However, rather than giving a better aesthetic, by not setting back the proposed extension at first floor, nor lowering the ridgeline, the additional scale and bulk would make the development unduly prominent and give it an obtrusive presence in the street scene. It would dominate its host and unbalance the semi-detached pair, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the building and wider area. There would therefore be a clear conflict with the SPD guidance.
11. The appellant has suggested that a planning condition requiring matching materials would ensure that a satisfactory appearance of the proposed extension is achieved. I agree that, if carefully controlled, a materials condition would avoid any unsightly junctions in the yellow brick of No 44, despite the absence of a set-back. However, control over materials alone would not adequately mitigate for the poor design. As such, a matching materials condition would not make the development acceptable.
12. Nos 34, 36 and 40 Pasture Rise have been extended at ground floor either forward of, or flush with the original front elevation, or with a very minimal set back. However, in contrast to the appeal proposal, these extensions have been set back from the front elevation at first floor. I note that 12 Maythorne Crescent and 31 Pasture Close have ground and first floor side extensions with no first-floor setback or lowered ridge level, but I have no evidence before me with regards the Council's application of the SPD guidance in these cases. Both houses, however,

have a very prominent front gable feature which provides some articulation to the front elevation and helps to temper the impact of the first-floor extension. I found these other extensions to be subservient to their host, and therefore they offer very limited support for the appeal proposal before me.

13. I conclude on the main issue that the proposed two-storey side extension would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the existing house, and its semi-detached pair. It would conflict with LP policies DS1, DS3 and DS5 which together require decisions to contribute to good design and high quality and inclusive places, and that development be appropriate to its context, in terms of scale, responding to existing patterns of development.

Other Considerations

14. I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty contained in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, which requires me to consider the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it. Protected characteristics include a person's disability or age.
15. The proposed development would provide a ground floor bedroom and lounge which would allow the appellant's elderly disabled parent to be cared for close to the family. Specifically, by not setting the proposed side extension back from the front elevation at ground floor, independent access would be achieved to the bedroom and lounge at the bottom of the stair. Similar ground floor accommodation would have been achieved should the previous appeal scheme have been built. The appellant's evidence is that the proposal to continue the front elevation at first floor, is to accommodate a larger master bedroom rather than to meet the needs of an elderly disabled parent. Consequently, I am satisfied that the needs of the elderly disabled parent can be met without causing the harm I have identified, and this matter does not therefore alter my conclusions in respect of the main issue.
16. Whilst I understand the appellant's concern that no communication was received from the Council after submission of the planning application, this is not a matter which would alter my findings above. I have determined the appeal on the planning merits of the case.

Conclusion

17. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

R Gravett

INSPECTOR