
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: 20 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/25/3369078

Briar Garth Lee Lane, Wilsden, Bradford, Bingley BD16 1UF

- 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 Rabina Aslam against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01282/HOU.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side and rear extension, roof alterations including front and rear dormers, modifications to outbuilding and boundary wall treatment.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council's first reason for refusal of the planning application was on the basis that it could not be determined as a householder application and that insufficient information was submitted to enable its proper consideration. I am aware of the interpretation of such in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). Nevertheless, the Council considered the scheme as a householder application and made a decision. Hence, the subsequent appeal being considered through the householder appeal service. I have therefore considered the proposal on this basis and on the description of development above.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and relevant development plan policies;
 - the effect of the development on the openness of the Green Belt;
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - whether any harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, would be clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the proposal.

Reasons

Whether inappropriate development

4. The appeal site is located along Lee Lane, which consists of a row of detached bungalows to one side of the road, set within open countryside. The site comprises a detached timber clad bungalow which has significant, flat roof extensions to its rear. To the side and rear of the bungalow there is a single storey outbuilding with attached store. To the back of the rear garden there is a structure shown on the submitted plans as an outbuilding, a static caravan which has been extended.
5. The entire appeal site is located within the general extent of the Green Belt as set out in the Key Diagram of the Bradford Core Strategy (2017) (CS). Policy GB1 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan for the Bradford District (2005) (UDP) states that except in very special circumstances, planning permission will not be given within the Green Belt unless it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.
6. The Framework states that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Paragraph 153 states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.
7. The Framework establishes that development within the Green Belt is inappropriate with the exceptions of the types of development listed in paragraph 154. One such example c), is the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. The Framework does not define a figure which represents disproportionate additions. The Bradford Householder Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD) states that where proposals result in an addition of over 30% of the original cubic volume, they are likely to be considered disproportionate.
8. The Framework states that the definition of the original building is as it existed on 1st July 1948. I have not been provided with information on the age of the bungalow, however it has clearly been significantly extended since it was originally constructed. There is no planning history for the extensions to the bungalow, nor for the static caravan and subsequent extensions to it. The appellant has put forward that the extensions have been in situ for more than 10 years. Nevertheless, there is no lawful development certificate before me to conclusively show the lawfulness of these structures.
9. The test in the Framework is one of size which can also include scale and massing. Although the proposed extensions to the footprint would largely comprise infilling or replacement of areas to be demolished, the proposed changes to the roofline and insertion of dormers in the bungalow would significantly increase its overall scale and massing in comparison with the form of the original building. The proposed development would result in further additions to the original building, which would be well in excess of the 30% threshold set out in the SPD. The proposal therefore amounts to substantial additions, which I find to be disproportionate over and above the size of the original building.

10. The submitted plans show that the static caravan has a kitchenette, bathroom and three bedrooms and it is separated from the main dwelling by approximately 11m. The evidence before me does not indicate that there would be a clear and functional link between this unit and the host dwelling. The proposed removal of the existing outbuilding to the side of the host dwelling would allow vehicle access to the static caravan and therefore it could reasonably operate as a separate independent dwelling. Even if I were to be satisfied that the static caravan would be functionally linked to the main household, the proposed extensions would add to the overall volume of additions to the host dwelling.
11. The proposal would result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. Consequently, the proposal comprises inappropriate development in the Green Belt, contrary to the aims of the above-mentioned policies.

Openness

12. A fundamental aim of Green Belt policy, as set out in paragraph 142 of the Framework, is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The openness of the Green Belt has a spatial aspect as well as a visual aspect.
13. The appeal site is prominent from public views as you progress along Lee Lane, due to its elevated position on the hillside. Notwithstanding the proximity of neighbouring dwellings, the openness of the Green Belt is clearly evident. The proposal would extend the built form into an area where there is presently none. Therefore, the cumulative increase to the footprint of the bungalow and static caravan and the increased height of the proposed extension to the host dwelling would lead to a loss of openness both visually and spatially. Accordingly, the proposed development would cause moderate harm to the visual and spatial openness of the Green Belt.
14. Consequently, the proposal would fail to preserve the openness of the Green Belt, contrary to the aims of the Framework.

Character and appearance

15. Whilst there is a mix of architectural styles along Lee Lane, the prevailing character is that of bungalows of modest scale. The dwellings follow a broadly similar building line and therefore, this in combination, with their height provides a uniform appearance to the surrounding area. The proposed changes to the roofline and addition of dormer windows would significantly increase the overall scale and massing of the dwelling, dominating its original form. The proposed roof alterations would be incongruous additions to the simple form of dwellings along this part of Lee Lane and erode its uniform appearance. The proposed boundary walls would have a stark appearance in comparison with the open, low-level boundary treatments with natural screening above of neighbouring properties and visually enclose the site. The proposal would therefore harm the character and appearance of the area.
16. I have been referred to the example at Brentwood, located a short distance from the appeal site. However, I have not been provided with the details of this case and therefore cannot be sure that it is directly comparable to this proposal. In any case, I have determined the appeal on the basis of its own merits, based on the evidence before me.

17. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policies EN2, EN5, EN7, EN8, DS1, DS2, DS3, DS4, DS5, TR2 and SC8 of the CS. Together these policies amongst other things seek to ensure that new development achieves good design of an appropriate scale which integrates into the landscape.

Other considerations

18. The appellant has not put forward any very special circumstances, however I recognise that it would provide additional living accommodation for the appellant which provides a minor benefit in favour of the proposal. I also note that the proposal would not cause harm to the amenity of neighbouring residents and no objections have been raised by neighbouring residents. However, these are neutral matters which neither weigh in favour nor against the development

Whether very special circumstances exist

19. The proposal would be inappropriate development within the Green Belt. In addition, there would be moderate harm to openness. In accordance with the Framework, substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt. There would also be harm to the character and appearance of the area which carries significant weight. The other considerations put forward provide minor support for the proposal. Therefore, the harms to the Green Belt and the character and appearance of the area would not be clearly outweighed by the other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the proposal. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and the material considerations, including the Framework, do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.

Conclusion

20. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Skelly

INSPECTOR