



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2025

by **N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/25/3366794

21 Canterbury Avenue, Bradford, BD5 0PY

- 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 Tahira Tanveer against the decision of the City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00140/HOU.
 - The development proposed is a retrospective rear extension with disabled facilities.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Planning permission was previously granted for the construction of a rear extension¹.
3. The Council states that the “built extensions to the rear have not seemingly been built in accordance with the previously approved plans under 21/01352/HOU. The current proposal would see the repositioning of the downstairs toilet facilities extending outwards from the existing rear extension...As the proposal has not been built in accordance with the previously approved application, the extensions to the rear are therefore unlawful development...”
4. I refer to the proposal and the proposed development in the decision below.
5. The planning application was made under a disability grant, and the Council draws my attention to its Householder Supplementary Planning Document (2012), which considers making an exception to design principles where there is not an alternative solution; the Council goes on to state that this does not mean that the local planning authority will allow for a poorly designed extension.

Main Issues

6. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, and its effect on the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers of Number 19 Canterbury Avenue, with regards to outlook and privacy.

¹ Reference: 21/01352/HOU.

Reasons

Local character

7. The appeal property is an end of terrace dwelling. Whilst located within a predominantly residential area, the dwelling fronts Canterbury Avenue and looks across to a gym and a mosque. The rear of the appeal dwelling backs onto an access lane and an area of public green space.
8. The appeal dwelling is set back from Canterbury Avenue behind a gated parking area, a wide footpath, and a grass verge. Canterbury Avenue itself is a wide road, with grass verges and footpaths to either side. The presence of street trees, green open space and views through to trees, parkland, and recreational facilities provides for a green, open and spacious environment.
9. The appeal dwelling has a relatively large yard/garden area to the rear. This is separated from the rear lane by a tall, gated feature.
10. The residential area within which the appeal property is located is characterised by the presence of two storey terraced dwellings set back from the road behind front gardens, albeit a number of gardens have been paved and converted to parking areas.
11. Many of the dwellings retain original features, including stone chimneys and unpainted stone-fronted gables and ground floor facades, and this presents an attractive sense of uniformity to parts of Canterbury Avenue. During my site visit, I observed that many dwellings have been altered and/or extended over time. Whilst the majority of such changes appear in keeping with host dwellings and the surrounding area, there are a number of examples of less sensitive development which serve to detract from the area's uniform qualities.
12. The proposal would result in a long rear extension projecting the full length of the rear yard, a large part of which would stretch across the full width of the dwelling. Further, it would include a ground floor toilet area, which would extend close to the shared boundary with Number 19 Canterbury Avenue and would result in the full extension being wider than the host dwelling.
13. As a result of the above, the proposal would severely reduce the garden area, such that the majority of the rear yard would be replaced by the extension. As a consequence, the rear extension would fail to appear as a subservient addition, and would overly dominate the rear of the appeal property.
14. The harm arising from this would be exacerbated as a result of the extension having two flat roofs of mis-matched heights. These would not only fail to visually correspond with one another but would also appear to jar with the pitch of the host dwelling's main roof. This would result in the extension appearing awkward, as well as drawing attention to the extension's overly large and bulky form.
15. Taking the above into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, and to Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017) (DPD), which, together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Living conditions

16. The side elevation of the proposed development would include windows facing directly towards the rear garden of No 19, and with clear views back to the rear facing windows of this neighbouring dwelling. These windows would be located close to No 19 and, consequently, I find that the proposal would inevitably give rise to such overlooking as to be harmful to the privacy of the occupiers of that property.
17. Further to the above, the proposed toilet area would extend very close to the shared rear boundary of the appeal dwelling and No 19. I find that this very close proximity would result in this element of the extension appearing as a dominant and oppressive feature, to the harm of the outlook of the occupiers of No 19.
18. Consequently, I find that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers of Number 19 Canterbury Avenue, with regards to outlook privacy, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Policies DS1 and DS5 of the DPD; and to the Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document (2012), which, together amongst other things, seek to protect residential amenity.

Other Matters

19. The appellant has provided evidence of physical disability and of health and wellbeing challenges. I empathise with and, in reaching my decision, I afford some weight to this. However, in this case, this is not something that outweighs the totality of harm identified above.
20. I note that the appellant has stated that she supports a different form of development to that the subject of this appeal. However, this appeal relates to the proposal before me, and I have found that it would result in significant harm, hence the decision below.
21. The appellant states that her relative lives in "the neighbouring property affected" and supports the proposal. However, this may not always be the case, and it does not amount to a factor that outweighs the harm identified.

Conclusion

22. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR