



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 December 2024 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by Chris Forrett BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/24/3352225

33 Leventhorpe Lane, Bradford, West Yorkshire BD8 0EG

- 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 Farukh Manzoor against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02128/HOU.
 - The development proposed is construction of first floor side, roof extension, part two storey rear extension and detached garden building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. I have taken the description of the development from the application form. However, I have removed the words 'resubmission of application 24/00461/HOU' as they are not a description of development.
4. The proposed development encompasses various elements which are described within the description in the banner heading above, some of which is broadly similar to what has been approved previously under application Ref. 23/03856/HOU. However, the main difference between what has been approved previously, and the development subject of this appeal is the inclusion of the proposed first floor side extension above the existing single-storey side extension adjacent to 31 Leventhorpe Lane. From the officer report, this also seems to be the main element of the proposal which the Council object to and I have therefore concentrated my recommendation on this element of the proposal.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed first floor side extension adjacent to 31 Leventhorpe Road on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal property (No 33) is a detached dwelling situated within a residential area. Whilst the wider part of Leventhorpe Lane features dwellings of varying

styles, the row from 25 to 35 are of a more consistent appearance. Although some of these dwellings have been extended, they all still feature a prominent front gable section combined with some similarities in the use of materials and window fenestration. In addition, whilst some of the dwellings on Leaventhorpe Lane have limited space to the sides as is noted by the appellant, within this particular group they more often feature single storey side extensions and garages which provide an appreciable space between the dwellings at first-floor level. Together these reoccurring features contribute positively to an orderly and coherent appearance in this part of the street scene.

7. The previously approved extension to the side adjacent to No 35 would be a sympathetic addition to the host dwelling. In contrast, the addition of the first-floor element to the side adjacent to No 31 would cumulatively result in a property which would appear overly wide in comparison to the neighbouring properties, and this would erode the feeling of spaciousness between the dwellings. Furthermore, the totality of the proposed extensions would not be subservient to the host dwelling and would dominate its appearance as a result of the overall width and bulk of the resultant dwelling. This harm is exacerbated by the inclusion of a new gable front on the first-floor extension which competes with the existing front gable and draws the eye to the overall scale and width of the scheme as a whole.
8. In coming to the above view, I acknowledge that it would not increase the footprint of the dwelling, and it would be setback from the front elevation. Additionally, the hedging along the side boundary and the use of matching materials would not be sufficient to overcome the harm of the first-floor side extension as it would still be an incongruous addition to the host building and the wider street scene.
9. My attention has been drawn to other developments within the locality of the appeal site and in particular the spacing between the respective properties. However, these examples either have an undeveloped area to one side of the property or a greater distance to the side boundaries where they are close on both side when compared to the cumulative extent of the appeal proposals. As such, none of these provide for a compelling reason to permit an otherwise unacceptable proposal.
10. I conclude, the proposed development would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. The proposal would conflict with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the City of Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017). Together these policies require that development proposals are informed by a good understanding of the site/area and its context, respond to existing positive patterns of development which contribute to the character of the area and create attractive streetscapes and spaces which are defined by the layout, scale and appearance of the buildings. It would also conflict with the overarching design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.
11. For the same reasons, the proposal would conflict with the guidance contained within the City of Bradford Householder Supplementary Planning Document (2012), which advises that extensions should maintain or improve the character and quality of the original house and wider area.

Other Matter

12. The proposal would undoubtedly improve the standard of amenity for occupiers of the dwelling, would make effective use of the site itself and provide economic and social benefits. However, none of these factors outweigh the harm of the proposal

on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area, as well as the conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed since it would conflict with the development plan.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence, and my representative's report, and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Chris Forrett

INSPECTOR