



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 June 2025

by Elaine Benson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/25/3363381

59 Northampton Street, Bradford BD3 0HS

- 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 Saqib Hussain against the decision of the City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/04143/HOU.
 - The development proposed is front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The porch has already been constructed and the appeal is determined on this basis. The main issue in this appeal, therefore, is the effect of the porch on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace in which it stands and the wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a mid-terraced house standing within a street of similar properties behind a low front boundary wall. The appearance of the terrace is broadly consistent, with some houses having dormer windows. The elevations are otherwise largely unchanged and present an attractive, cohesive and uniform appearance. The Council indicates that 2 other porches on the terrace are unauthorised and cannot therefore be considered to set a precedent for the appeal proposal.
4. The appeal porch projects forward from the front elevation of No 59 to the edge of the adjacent pavement. Its depth and massing result in a form of development that is significantly out of proportion with the modest scale of the terraced property. Whilst the porch has been constructed with high quality, matching materials, it nonetheless overly dominates the front elevation of the house due to the extent of its projection and its overall scale and form. I conclude that the porch therefore harms the character and appearance of the host property. For the same reasons it also fails to respect the design quality of the terrace in which it stands.
5. The design of the terrace opposite is different, principally due to its front bays and stepped entrances. However, the harmonious design of both terraces results in a well-balanced street-scene. The introduction of the porch into this context is visually

intrusive and its incongruous appearance harms the character and appearance of Northampton Street and those of the wider area.

6. The appellant states that advice relating to the 'permitted development' criteria for porches was sought from the Council prior to the construction of the appeal porch. He indicates that the telephone advice received was incomplete as he was not told that no part of the porch should be within 2m of the property's boundary with the road. Whilst I have some sympathy for the appellant in this regard, there is no evidence supporting this claim. Furthermore, the relevant legislation is widely and publicly available. But in any event, this appeal can only be determined on its merits as planning permission has been applied for and refused by the Council. Decisions relating to potential enforcement action are matters for the Council rather than this appeal.
7. The appellant refers to the Council's approval of an extension constructed in nearby Prospect Road/Falmouth Avenue. I do not have full details of that proposal or any comments from the Council in this regard. However, the context of that development, including its relationship to both adjoining road frontages, and the design of the extension are materially different to those of the appeal site. I can therefore give this example little weight. Furthermore, the appeal proposal must be determined on its individual merits.
8. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal proposal harms the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace in which it stands and the wider area. It is therefore contrary to Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Council's Core Strategy Development Plan Document, which among other things, and of relevance to this appeal, seek to achieve good design which relates to its context.
9. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR