



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2025

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/25/3366211

5 Waterside, Bingley BD16 2SN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr. Peter Webb against the decision of the City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 24/04123/HOU
 - The development proposed is described as Single storey rear extension to existing dwelling. First floor front extension over existing ground floor footprint. Rear extension and roof alteration to existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on trees.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies within a predominantly residential area, comprising mainly large detached properties. The trees on the appeal site and surrounding area are protected by a Tree Preservation Order and contribute to the sylvan character and appearance of the area.
4. An Arboricultural Method Statement has been provided by the appellant to support the proposal. This Statement has not been produced in accordance with relevant professional standards providing limited information relating to the trees on the site and the potential effect of the development on them.
5. The appellant confirms that the proposed garage and rear extension would accommodate a photovoltaic system in order to provide low carbon, renewable energy generation, this is not detailed on the plans however does not outweigh the potential harm to the trees.
6. I find that the appellant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not harm protected trees. There is conflict with Policy EN5 of the Local Plan for Bradford District, Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017), which seeks amongst other things seeks to protect and enhance trees and woodland cover.

Conclusion

7. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR