



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 September 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/25/3370886

1 Broomhill Drive, Keighley BD21 1NG

- 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 Shakir Ahmed Choudhury against the decision of the City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 25/01249/HOU.
 - The development proposed is described as householder planning for a 2 storey side extension of an existing two storey semi-detached house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the living conditions of occupiers of No's. 30 and 32 Lawnswood Road.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies within a predominantly residential area, comprising mainly terraced or semi-detached properties. The appeal site is at an elevated position in comparison to No's. 30 and 32 Lawnswood Road which would face onto the proposed development.
4. The proposed development would extend the built form of the existing property closer to the shared boundary with No's. 30 and 32. Whilst the proposed development would be set down in terms of roof ridge height from that of the original property and despite the presence of a detached outbuilding within rear garden of No. 32 views towards the proposed development would be prominent and overbearing.
5. I find that due to the scale and location of the proposed development at an elevated position the proposed development would be dominant and oppressive to the occupiers of the neighbouring properties. Due to the orientation of proposed development which would be to the south/southwest of No's 30 and 32 the appeal proposal would overshadow the private rear gardens of the neighbouring properties, which would reduce the enjoyment of the garden.
6. I conclude that the proposed development would harm living conditions of occupiers of No's. 30 and 32 Lawnswood Road. There is conflict with Policy DS5

of the Local Plan for Bradford District, Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017), which amongst other things seeks to protect the amenity of existing or prospective residents.

Other Matters

7. The appellant has highlighted that the proposed development is required due to personal circumstances, in terms of physical and medical need. I have had regard to the comments raised. I have not been provided with substantive evidence to demonstrate that the proposed development would be the only way to fulfil the needs of the appellant, I therefore give this limited weight.
8. The appellant has drawn my attention to other two-storey side extensions in the surrounding area. I have not been provided with substantive evidence to compare developments to the one before me, nevertheless during my site visit I did not observe any comparable development, I give this limited weight.
9. The appellant has raised procedural concerns relating to the determination of the application in relation to the lack of contact between the Council and the appellant during the determination of the application. This is beyond the remit of this appeal and does not influence my findings.

Conclusion

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

C Pipe

INSPECTOR