



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2025

by **D Ellis MPlan MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/24/3357302

Brighton House, Dyehouse Road, Bradford BD12 7BX

- 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 Emmott against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/02858/HOU.
 - The development proposed is a single storey orangery.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I am informed that the site address on the original application form is incorrect. In the header above I have therefore used the site address from the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is one of a pair of semi-detached dwellings in an L-shaped configuration. A single-storey side extension was under construction at the time of my site visit, and I note reference to a planning permission for such works¹. The southern elevation of the original property is symmetrical in appearance with ground floor bay windows either side of the entrance door, and ornate architectural detailing including eave brackets and first-floor window headers. Overall, the southern elevation has an attractive and harmonious appearance which contributes strongly to the character of the dwelling.
5. Design Principle 1 in Section 2 of the Local Development Framework for Bradford Householder Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD) states that the size, position and form of extensions should maintain or improve the character and quality of the original house.
6. Although most of the proposed extension would be attached to the side elevation of the adjoining property, the extension would abut a bay window, with one side of the bay window hidden from external view. The position and massing of the extension would undermine the contribution of the bay window to the appearance

¹ Planning application ref. 24/01061/HOU

of the elevation, and it would disrupt the symmetry of the original southern elevation.

7. While landscaping may provide some screening of the southern elevation when the plants are in leaf, the elevation and extension would be highly visible from the street during the winter months when the leaves have dropped and from within the site itself. I am also unconvinced that the erection of 2-metre-high fencing within the site would sufficiently obscure views of the proposal. As a result, the proposed extension would be an incongruous addition that would not harmonise with the existing property. Furthermore, the aim of Design Principle 1 of the SPD would not be achieved.
8. Technical Guidance² states ‘in most cases the principal elevation will be that part of the house which fronts (directly or at an angle) the main highway serving the house...’ and ‘It will usually contain the main architectural features such as main bay windows or a porch serving the main entrance to the house. Usually, but not exclusively, the principal elevation will be what is understood to be the front of the house.’
9. The southern elevation fronts Dyehouse Road at an angle and contains the bay windows and architectural detailing, whereas the northern elevation does not face onto Dyehouse Road and contains very limited fenestration. The southern elevation could therefore reasonably be considered as the principal elevation, and as such I am not convinced that the suggested fallback option of an extension under permitted development rights exists. There is no lawful development certificate before me to conclusively show otherwise.
10. The proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and would therefore be contrary to Policies DE1 and DE3 of the Local Plan for the Bradford District Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017). These policies require, amongst other things, for development to be of a high-quality design, to be appropriate in terms of their layout and details, and to retain and integrate existing built features.

Other Matters

11. The nearby Lower Woodland farmhouse and barn are both Grade II listed buildings. However, the distance between these buildings and the appeal site together with the modest scale of the proposed extension would ensure that the proposal would not have any significant effect on the setting of the listed buildings.

Conclusion

12. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

D Ellis

INSPECTOR

² Permitted development rights for householders, MHCLG (September 2019)