



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 September 2025

by **C Skelly BA (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/25/3366162

2 Whitehead Place, Bradford, BD2 3NB

- 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 Atsham Ali against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00516/HOU.
 - The development proposed is a replacement outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area; and
 - whether the proposed development would harm the living conditions of residents of 4 Whitehead Place with regards to daylight and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site comprises the front garden of 2 Whitehead Place, one of a pair of two storey semi-detached dwellings. The garden adjoins the corner of Whitehead Place and Fagley Road and is enclosed by stone walls with planting above. Access to the garden is via timber gates off Whitehead Place. A footway runs between the appeal site and 27 Fagley Road. The surrounding streets are characterised by terraced housing of similar style with small front gardens. This regular pattern of development provides a uniform appearance to the surrounding area.
4. The proposal is to replace the existing outbuilding located within the front garden with a larger outbuilding. The submitted plans show that the outbuilding would contain a garden room and a storeroom. The footprint of the proposed outbuilding would be larger than that of the host property and surrounding dwellings. Whilst it would be single storey and set at a lower ground level to the host property, the large footprint and roof span would have a horizontal emphasis, which would be visually at odds with the established vertical character of the surrounding terraces. The proposal would take up much of the garden space, leaving only a small gap between it and Whitehead Place, thereby dominating the appearance of the

appeal site. The overall massing of the proposed outbuilding and enclosure of much of the garden space would be an incongruous addition, which would erode the uniform appearance of the surrounding area.

5. Although there is existing hedging and other vegetation along the boundary, this could be removed at any time. I therefore do not consider that this would provide appropriate mitigation to the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, particularly given its prominent corner position within the street scene.
6. The proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area and thereby conflicts with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Bradford Core Strategy and Development Plan Document (2017) (CS). Together these policies seek to ensure that development is appropriate to the local context and contributes to the character of the area.

Living conditions

7. No 4 Whitehead Place has a smaller garden than No 2 and faces onto the rear elevation of 27 Fagley Road, with a separation distance of approximately 4m. I observed that the south facing windows of No 4 appear to be the main source of daylight and outlook from habitable rooms at the ground floor level. The setback arrangement between the appeal site and adjoining properties provides a sense of openness to No 4 and its outdoor space. Although the proposed outbuilding would be single storey, as it would align with the rear elevation of No 27 Fagley Road and extend across almost the entire width of the appeal site, the built form would increase the sense of enclosure of No 4 and its outdoor space. As No 4 is south facing the proposed development would result in the loss of daylight to habitable rooms on the ground floor level, making them dark and gloomy.
8. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions of the residents of 4 Whitehead Place with regards to daylight and outlook. It thereby conflicts with Policy DS5 of the CS which amongst other things seeks to protect the amenity of existing residents.

Conclusion

9. The proposed outbuilding would provide additional storage and living space for the appellant. However, it would harm the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area and the living conditions of the residents of No 4 Whitehead Place in relation to daylight and outlook. These harms are not outweighed by the benefits which I have identified and are sufficient to justify dismissing the appeal.
10. 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.
11. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Skelly

INSPECTOR