



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2023

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/23/3328385

5 Bull Royd Avenue, Bradford BD8 0AX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO)
 - The appeal is made by Mr Tariq against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/01618/PNH, dated 10 May 2023, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is construction of single storey rear extension of the following dimensions : depth of proposed extension from rear wall of original dwellinghouse 5.00 : maximum height of proposed extension 3.70 : height to eaves of proposed extension 2.50.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is whether the proposal would comply with Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling, with a pebble-dash exterior, consistent with neighbouring properties. The locality is predominately residential in nature.
4. The Council's reason for refusal sets out that the proposal would result in the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse extending beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse and which would have a width greater than half the width of the original dwellinghouse. This would be contrary to the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, Paragraph A.1 (j) (iii) of the GPDO.
5. The appeal property has a stepped rear elevation, with a section to the rear of the property indicated as a dining area projecting beyond the remaining section. This small projection creates a "second" side elevation other than the traditional side elevation. The proposal would stretch across the full width of the rear elevation.
6. The appeal proposal would extend beyond the small section of side elevation formed from the projection of the dining area and would therefore extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse. Furthermore, the proposal would have a width greater than half the width of

the original dwellinghouse, given that it would span the full width of the rear of the building. Consequently, the proposal would fail to comply with Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A, Paragraph A.1 (j) (iii) of the GPDO.

Other Matters

7. The appellant has indicated that the proposals are made in connection with disabled facilities. Whilst I have some sympathy with this position, I have to assess this appeal on its compliance with the GPDO.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, the proposed scheme could not benefit from deemed permission under Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO. I therefore conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR