



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2025

by **Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/25/3366673

133 Lynfield Drive, Bradford, BD9 6ET

- 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 Mrs Mehreen Akhtar against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01226/HOU.
 - The development proposed is described as '6m rear single storey extension, loft conversion with front and rear dormers'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the rear extension.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the roof extension and dormers and permission is granted for a hip to gable roof extension with front and rear dormers at 133 Lynfield Drive, Bradford, BD9 6ET in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/01226/HOU, subject to the following conditions:-
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans insofar as they relate to the hip to gable roof extension with front and rear dormers only: Proposed elevations EL-200; Proposed plans PL-100; Proposed site plan PL-104.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the dormers hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Procedural matter

3. The Council's decision refers to the proposal as 'rear single storey extension, hip to gable roof extension with front and rear dormers' and as this describes the proposal more fully, I have considered it on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issues in this case are the effect of:-
 - the proposed rear extension on the living conditions of the occupiers of nos 131 and 135 Lynfield Drive in regard to light and outlook;

- the proposed front dormer on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

Living conditions

5. The appeal dwelling is a small, semi-detached two storey house within an estate of similar dwellings that were built as local authority housing on modestly sized plots. It has a close relationship to the surrounding dwellings. The dwelling sits on the same building line as the adjoining dwelling at no 131 and its rear garden is separated by a standard height fence. The rear garden is sited on rising land above the ground level of this pair of dwellings and tapers towards the end. Although no 131 has a small projection on its rear elevation, the proposed extension would project beyond that, some 6m from the rear elevation and adjacent to the tapered side boundary. It would be clearly seen from a rear facing habitable room window in no 131 and from the small raised patio area to that property. Due to its length and proximity, and despite the rising land to the rear, it would be overly dominant in the outlook from that window and from the patio at no 131. Its siting to the west of no 131 would also result in the loss of some late afternoon and evening sunlight to that window and patio. Given the small size of the rear garden at no 131, this would be significant.
6. The other neighbouring dwelling at no 135 is sited at almost a 90° angle and has a very shallow rear garden, separated from the appeal site by only a low fence along the tapered boundary. As such, the rear windows and garden of no 135 would face almost directly the proposed extension which would follow that boundary for a length of 6m, set in by only just over 1m. Given its very close proximity to the rear windows and garden of no 135, it would result in an oppressive and overbearing outlook when seen from there. Its proximity and position to the south-east of no 135 would result in a loss of some morning/midday sunlight to the rear garden which given its small size would be significant. The impact on outlook and light would not be mitigated sufficiently even if higher fencing were erected as the appellant has suggested.
7. I have noted that the Council issued a notice that prior approval was not required for a 5m length rear extension in 2021 but that has since lapsed, and I have insufficient evidence to find that there is a fallback position that is likely to be implemented and would cause significantly greater harm than this proposal should this appeal fail.
8. I conclude then that the proposed rear extension would cause significant harm to the outlook and light of the neighbouring occupiers at nos 131 and 135. It would therefore be contrary to development plan policy DS5 of the Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017) (CS) which requires that proposals do not harm the amenity of residents.
9. I have noted the personal circumstances of the appellant and her family, and that the proposal would facilitate access and useability for a family member. However, even if I had more compelling evidence of the need for that, I have not been persuaded that there is no other means of providing it in a more appropriate manner, either through an alternative layout of the existing accommodation or a more appropriately sited, scaled and designed extension. That matter does not,

therefore, outweigh the harm I have identified and the conflict with the development plan.

Character and appearance

10. The proposal includes a flat roofed dormer that would be sited on the front roof slope. There are many similar examples in the surrounding area, although some of those that have been constructed are likely to be permitted development. The proposed dormer would be some 2.98m in width with a fascia board of 3.2m in width. As such, it only slightly exceeds the Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) that requires a maximum width of 3m. Importantly it is very similar in size to a recently built front dormer opposite at no 136 that was approved by the Council. There are no significant differences in size and scale between that and the current proposal and it would therefore be perverse to dismiss this part of the proposed development on those grounds.
11. The Council has also objected to the extent of the proposed tile cladding materials that are proposed on both the front and sides of the dormer. As its SPD requires that only the sides of the dormer are clad, the proposal would be contrary to that. However, a condition requiring the approval of further details of the materials for the dormers would overcome that objection and is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene.
12. As such, I find that the proposed front dormer would accord with development plan policies DS1 and DS3 which together seek to ensure that proposals achieve good design and create attractive streetscapes.
13. The Council says that the proposed hip to gable roof extension benefits from permitted development rights and was not considered under this application. However, as the approved scheme at no 136 included a very similar roof extension, there is no reason for me to dismiss that part of the proposal either. The Council has not objected to the rear roof dormer and from what I have seen that would be acceptable. Those elements would also accord with the policies above.

Conditions

14. In addition to the standard commencement condition and materials condition referred to earlier, a condition is necessary requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans (except for the rear extension) to provide certainty.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed rear extension would be contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that. The appeal should be dismissed insofar as it relates to the rear extension.
16. The proposed hip to gable roof extension with front and rear dormers would accord with the development plan and the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to those parts of the proposal.

Sarah Colebourne

INSPECTOR