



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 July 2019 by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA

Decision by A U Ghafoor BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/19/3227219

32 Northdale Mount, Bradford, BD5 9AP

- 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 J Hunter against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00412/HOU, dated 29 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. It appeared work had started on site. However, the appeal has been made against the Council's decision to refuse planning permission for the development described above. I shall proceed on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The Council's main objection is the proposed first floor. The main issue is the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers at no. 30 Northdale Mount, regarding outlook and sunlight.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. No. 32 is a semi-detached property located within an established residential area. The development would project beyond the rear wall of the host property by approximately about 3 metres. No. 30 has an existing single storey rear extension measuring approximately 3 m, and a first-floor window close to the boundary. The proposed first floor would have a detrimental effect on outlook from the adjoining property because of its height, bulk and siting. It would result in an oppressive form of development. The proposal would introduce a solid brick facade in proximity to a habitable room window.
6. The Council consider the proposal would overshadow the nearest first floor window to no. 30 and breach the 45-degree line, although the evidence presented does not include sunlight assessment. Nonetheless, the development

would have an over-powering and dominant visual effect when seen from no. 30, due to the extension's scale.

7. For these reasons the proposed development would cause harm to the occupants of no. 30. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy DS5 of the Local Plan for the Bradford District Core Strategy Development Plan Document, July 2017, and guidance in the Householder Supplementary Planning Document (2012).

Conclusion and Recommendation

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L M Wilson

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

9. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I too concur that the appeal should be dismissed.

A U Ghafoor

Inspector