



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 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: 10 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/19/3231428

4 Grange Road, Riddlesden, Keighley, West Yorkshire, BD20 5AA

- 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 Mrs S Ahmed against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00245/HOU, dated 18 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single 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. At the time of my visit, a single storey rear extension had been constructed. There are differences between the extension built and the plans that are before me. For the avoidance of doubt, I will determine the appeal on the basis of the plans that are before me.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposed extension on the living conditions of the occupants of no. 2 Grange Road, with particular reference to outlook and light.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. No. 4 is a two-storey semi-detached property. The street scene has a strong rhythm with semi-detached properties set back from the highway and separated by driveways.
6. The extension would project 1 metre above the recommended projection contained within the Householder Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD). No. 2 has one ground floor rear window close to the boundary and a smaller garden due to a corner plot. There are a number of neighbouring properties which sit higher than no. 2 and the garden currently has a sense of enclosure. Whilst the extension would be slightly stepped in from the common boundary it would be noticeably higher than the existing stone boundary wall.

The development would dominate the outlook from within this property's habitable room because of the height and depth of the extension located in proximity to the window. In addition, the extension would result in the rear garden being dominated by a high blank wall.

7. Similarly, the proposal would also impact the amount of light which would reach the ground floor habitable room. The rear elevations of the properties are north-east facing. The extension would not result in an unacceptable loss of direct sunlight reaching the rear of no. 2, nor result in significant overshadowing as the existing built form limits the amount of sunlight to the rear of the properties. Nevertheless, the development would lead to a significant reduction in the amount of daylight reaching the neighbour's habitable room because of the height, bulk and siting of the extension.
8. The appellant wishes to provide additional space for their growing family are personal circumstances which do not outweigh the harm caused by the development. Personal circumstances rarely outweigh general planning considerations as the occupants of a dwelling can change whereas the extension would be permanent.
9. For these reasons above, I find that the proposed extension would result in the living conditions of the occupants of no. 2 Grange Road being significantly adversely affected by a loss of outlook and daylight. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with Policies DS3 and DS5 of the Local Plan for the Bradford District Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017), the SPD and the Framework.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

L M Wilson

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

A U Ghafoor

INSPECTOR