



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2025

by **E Heron MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31st March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/24/3357212

112 Bolton Lane, Bradford BD2 4BA

- 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 M Hussain against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02575/HOU.
 - The development proposed is construction of part two storey extension to side and rear and single storey extension to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The area is in a suburban rolling hillside location, and as such there are pronounced steps between houses, and views down towards dwellings from elevated vantage points. The appeal site is within a row of semi-detached dwellings that share similar characteristics such as hipped roofs, space to the side, and brick and render finish. The majority have a flush finish horizontal emphasis, however at intervals, some pairings have symmetrical gable frontages, providing additional interest and an element of verticality. There are large two storey extensions within the locality, however a predominant feature of the appeal site context is the space between buildings.
4. The appeal property sits at the top of the row, with space between it and the neighbouring dwelling, no. 110. The semi-detached pair comprising the appeal site and no. 114, incorporate the gable frontage features, and there are views down towards the rear of the two dwellings from further uphill around the road bend.
5. The proposed extension would have a degree of subserviency as it would be set well back from the front face of the dwelling and set down from the main ridge. However, its side projection would be very close to the gable of no. 110, and it would be significantly taller than that property. The closing of the gap, coupled with the pronounced height difference would result in a cramped and jarring arrangement. Furthermore, the projection to the rear, visible from the road, would be bulky with a discordant, complicated roof style, which would not respond

positively to the overall massing and simple roof form of the host dwelling and the semi-detached pair.

6. The appellant has referenced a previously approved extension, (Council Ref. 23/04240/HOU). The dashed line annotation shown in their statement suggests that the previously approved scheme was more subservient than the appeal proposal, at least in terms of the sideways projection relative to the proportions of the main house, and the rear extension appears less bulky. Notwithstanding the lack of details of the elevations of the approved extension, on the basis of this information I conclude that the approved scheme would be less harmful in terms of its impact on the street scene. I therefore attribute limited weight to this factor.
7. I have taken account of the development at 189-191 Queens Road. Whilst I note from the aerial photograph that the rear roof arrangement has similarities to the appeal proposal, the rear elevation is not apparent within the street scene.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area. As such it conflicts with policies DS1 and DS3 of the Local Plan for the Bradford District, Core Strategy Development Plan Document, adopted July 2017. Amongst other things, these policies require new development to contribute to good design and high quality places by responding positively to context in terms of layout, scale, and details.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

E Heron

INSPECTOR