
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2025

by **H Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/25/3364387

23 New Brighton, Cottingley, Bingley, Bradford BD16 1UR

- 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 Andrew Mawson against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/04312/HOU.
 - The development proposed is demolition of an existing single storey flat roof section of building and re-build as 1.5 storeys with the first floor within the roof space. Raise the height of the existing pitched roof to create a single ridge line.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Development had commenced at the time of my site visit. However, I have determined the appeal based on the plans submitted to the Council and upon which the views of interested parties were sought.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies; and
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Inappropriate Development

4. Paragraph 142 of the Framework outlines the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy which is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. The Framework, at paragraphs 154 and 155, sets out the categories of development which may be regarded as not inappropriate in the Green Belt, subject to certain conditions.
5. The appellant states that the appeal site is previously developed land and the proposal should be considered with regard to paragraph 154g) of the Framework which states that the limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed land (including a material change of use to residential or mixed use including residential), whether redundant or in continuing use (excluding

temporary buildings), which would not cause substantial harm to the openness of the Green Belt would not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt.

6. Previously developed land is defined in the Framework as land which has been lawfully developed and is or was occupied by a permanent structure and any fixed surface infrastructure associated with it, including the curtilage of the developed land (although it should not be assumed that the whole of the curtilage should be developed). It goes on to say that land in built up areas such as residential gardens is excluded.
7. In this case the appeal site is at the end of New Brighton, a single street within the Green Belt distinct from nearby settlements and therefore not within a built-up area. There appears to be no dispute between the parties that the proposal constitutes redevelopment of previously developed land. From the evidence before me I see no reason to disagree.
8. The increase in height and mass particularly at first floor level would alter the appearance of the building which would be more visible and prominent from the nearby dwellings resulting in a loss of openness to the Green Belt in visual terms. Whilst there would be some loss of openness resulting from the proposal, it would be of a moderate scale and localised in nature. It follows that the effect on the openness of the Green Belt would not reach the threshold of substantial harm under criterion 154g) and the proposal would therefore not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Consequently, the proposal would not conflict with the Green Belt objectives of the Framework.
9. Given my findings with regard to paragraph 154g) it is not necessary for me to consider whether paragraph 154c) applies to the proposal, notwithstanding the Council's concerns regarding whether the extension is a disproportionate addition over and above the size of the original building. It is also not necessary to consider the proposal under paragraph 154e). In addition, as the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt there is no requirement to assess if there are other considerations that amount to very special circumstances needed to justify the development.

Character and Appearance

10. The appeal site lies within the designated Green Belt and is a previously extended dwelling at the end of a row of dwellings along New Brighton. These are of a mixed style and design.
11. The appeal property has the appearance of a semi-detached dwelling, although I note that the appellant contends that it was originally a detached dwelling. Notwithstanding this, it adjoins the neighbouring property, and the roof flashing is attached to the neighbouring property.
12. The proposal would raise the height of the eaves, and the gable end of the proposed extension would be higher than the pitched roof of the adjoining property resulting in an incongruous juxtaposition of the dwellings. It would also increase the dominance of the building and result in an unsympathetic addition to the host dwelling which would no longer appear subservient to the adjoining dwelling.
13. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Local Plan for Bradford

Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2017 which together and amongst other matters seek to ensure that development achieves good design and is appropriate to its context.

Other Matters

14. I have had regard to the previous approval¹ which resulted in an increase to the ridge height of part of the roof and changes to the character of the building. However, as described above, the increase in height of the remaining part of the roof and its juxtaposition with the roof of the neighbouring property would harm the character and appearance of the area.
15. I acknowledge that the proposal would increase and improve the living space for the occupiers, including introducing additional daylight and be constructed with reclaimed stone. These matters however do not outweigh the harm I have found to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

16. Although the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt it would harm the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, the proposed development would conflict with the development plan, and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given the appeal should be dismissed.

H Senior

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/W4705/D/10/2132983