
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2021

by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/21/3275146

2 Carrholm Green, Bradford BD6 2NP

- 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 Shakeel Khan against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00008/HOU, dated 4 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in July 2021. This has replaced the 2019 iteration. Whilst there have been some changes to content and thus paragraph numbers, the substance of the Framework as it relates to the main issues of the case have not changed. I have not therefore sought the views of the main parties since, for these reasons, their respective cases would not be prejudiced. I have proceeded on this basis.

Main Issues

3. There are two main issues. These are the effect of the proposed development on a) the character and appearance of the area; and b) the living conditions of the occupiers of 21 Lingdale Road, with particular regard to outlook and sunlight.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling which is orientated at 90 degrees from Lingdale Road and fronts an open green and a play park. Due to this layout and the generous space to the side of the appeal property, this part of the street scene has a pleasant, open and spacious character and causes the dwelling, including its side elevation, to be highly prominent in the public realm.
5. The proposed extension would have a substantial width and lack a set back from the front elevation of the host property. It would therefore introduce considerable massing which would significantly alter the form and appearance of the dwelling and fail to read as a subservient addition. In taking up the

amount of space it would, the extension would noticeably and detrimentally erode the spacious feel to the street scene.

6. Accordingly, this proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area and would conflict with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Local Plan for the Bradford District Core Strategy Development Plan Document (the CS) and the guidance within the Householder Supplementary Planning Document (April 2012) (the SPD). Collectively, these policies and guidance seek to ensure that developments are informed by and appropriate to their context and maintain or improve the character and quality of the original house and wider area. Furthermore, it would conflict with the requirement of the Framework to achieve good design.

Living Conditions

7. The proposed development would introduce a solid mass of considerable width within close proximity to the side boundary of 21 Lingdale Road. Due to the excessive scale of the proposal and this close relationship, it would be an overly dominant addition which would result in an uninviting outlook from and overbearing sense of enclosure to users of the garden. Additionally, given the orientation of No 21's garden relative to the extension, the space would suffer from an unacceptable loss of sunlight through overshadowing, further reducing the quality of the private amenity space for users.
8. Consequently, the proposed development would harm the living conditions of occupiers at No 21 and would, as a result, conflict with Policy DS5 of the CS, the guidance in the SPD and the Framework which collectively seek to ensure that developments do not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents.

Conclusion

9. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no other considerations, including the letters of support, that outweigh this conflict. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

H Ellison
INSPECTOR