
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: 21 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/25/3368886

3 Ridge View Gardens, Bradford, BD10 9ER

- 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 Jessica Brown against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00228/HOU.
 - The development proposed is front and rear dormers and single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development in the banner heading above has removed wording relating to retrospective as this is not a form of development. The application form confirms that the development has been completed, and I was able to see this during my site visit. I have determined the scheme based on the drawings submitted.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the scheme on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a brick built, two storey dwelling located in a residential area. The dwelling is located on a slope and the side elevation of the property faces over the side garden of No 6. At the bottom of Ridge View Gardens there is an area of open space with mature trees and therefore the appeal site is visually open and prominent within the street scene. The appeal site adjoins a dwelling which although of similar architectural style has mock-Tudor rendering. Whilst there is some regularity to the appearance of the surrounding area, the St John's Thorpe Edge Church and adjoining dwelling, located opposite the appeal site have distinctly different architectural styles.
5. Planning permission was granted under LPA reference 22/04942/HOU for a single storey side extension and dormers to the front and rear (the approved plans). The approved plans show that the dormers would be stepped down from the ridgeline of the host property and the dormer cheeks would match those of the existing roof.
6. Although the dormers as built are not flush with the ridge height of the host dwelling, the step down is minimal and visually imperceptible. Whilst the difference

between the proposed set down indicated on the approved plans and that which has been built is small in size, the larger set down would provide a clear visual difference providing the dormers with a subservient appearance. The lack of set down and use of dark grey PVCu cladding gives the dormers a top-heavy appearance which dominates the host dwelling and harms the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

7. A further single storey, flat roof extension has also been constructed which adjoins the approved extension. As this element has a stepped design and smaller footprint it retains a subservient appearance to the host dwelling. Nevertheless, the front elevation is flush to the approved side extension, and a door and window have been inserted, which essentially creates two front doors to the dwelling. The cumulative impact of these features along with the flat roof and splayed side wall, creates a visually awkward addition which undermines the proportionate appearance of the host dwelling and harms the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
8. Whilst I note the support for the scheme from the adjoining residents at 1 Ridge View Gardens, this does not in itself render the scheme acceptable.
9. Therefore, I conclude that the scheme harms the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. It thereby conflicts with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Bradford District Core Strategy (2017), which seek amongst other things to ensure that development proposals contribute to achieving good design and high-quality places.

Other Matters

10. The appellant states that the single storey extension is necessary for the storage of medical supplies required to manage her daughter's health condition. The appellant's daughter has a protected characteristic as set out in Section 149 of the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED), contained in the Equality Act 2010. The PSED sets out the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation, and to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it, to which I have had due regard. Whilst I acknowledge the impracticalities of storing medical supplies in the bedroom space I have not been provided with any information to demonstrate that the extension is the only option available for this purpose. Therefore, I can only attach moderate weight to the need for additional space, which does not outweigh the significant harms I have identified.
11. The appellant has submitted a letter from their GP in relation to the impact of the planning investigations on their health and well-being. Although I recognise the stressful nature of the situation, the evidence before me demonstrates that the Council contacted the appellant at an early stage to confirm that the development should be carried out strictly in accordance with the approved plans, providing the opportunity to address any proposed changes to the scheme at an early stage, however no advice appears to have been sought.

Conclusion

12. 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.

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

C Skelly

INSPECTOR