



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2025

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/25/3369501

18 Hilton Avenue, Shipley, West Yorkshire BD18 2AJ

- 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 Syed Asif Hussain Shah against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00880/HOU.
 - The development proposed is hip to gable roof with front and rear dormer and two-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of the development provided on the planning application form has been replaced by an amended version on the decision notice. I consider that subsequent description to accurately represent the proposal and I have therefore used it within this decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the:
 - Character and appearance of the host property and the streetscape; and
 - Living conditions of occupants of 16 Hilton Avenue with regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site consists of a semi-detached dwelling with a hipped roof located at the head of the cul-de-sac. Reference has been made to previous permissions granted for extensions to the dwelling, and construction works were underway at the time of my visit.
5. The proposal would include a substantial 'L' shaped two-storey extension to the side of the property. The Council's SPD¹ advises that two-storey side extensions should be no wider than two thirds of the width of the original house in order to appear subordinate to the host dwelling. The proposed extension would significantly exceed this. Although part of the side extension would have a

¹ Householder Supplementary Planning Document

significant step back from the front elevation, this would not be sufficient to mitigate for the unacceptable scale and design of the extension as a whole.

6. The SPD also advises that the front elevation of two storey extensions should normally be set back by 1 metre from the principal elevation. The Council sets out that the proposal would not comply with this due to the protruding ground floor bay window. However, the submitted plans show that the bay window was an existing feature. That said, the roof of the extension would also not be set down 1 metre below the original ridge of the host building as recommended in the SPD, which would add to the overdominant appearance of the extension.
7. The proposal would also include a mixture of gable and hipped roof designs which would give the extension a clumsy and incongruous appearance which would jar with the original dwelling and other dwellings in the streetscape. The excessive height of the roof/canopy over the ground floor bay window would also contrast uncomfortably with the existing sloped roof above the extant front bay window.
8. Considered as a whole, the proposed two-storey side extension would appear as a disproportionate addition to the host dwelling and would be of a scale and design that would harm the character and appearance of the appeal site and the streetscape. Although the extension would be located to the side and rear of the host building, its scale and design would still be apparent in views from Hilton Avenue as well as from nearby properties.
9. The rear dormer would also be of an excessive size that would be an overdominant box-like addition to the rear roofslope. The appellant states that a rear dormer has previously been approved by the Council, although I have not been provided with details of this. In any event, should the appellant wish to progress this dormer as a fallback scheme then this is more appropriately addressed as part of the previous approval rather than the appeal proposal.
10. Drawing the above together, the proposed side extension and rear dormer would appear as disproportionate and incongruous additions to the host building, with significant harm to the host property and the streetscape. The proposal would therefore conflict with the design and character requirements of Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2017 (the Core Strategy). The proposal would also conflict with the design principles of the SPD.

Living Conditions

11. The side extension would be located close to the boundary with 16 Hilton Avenue, and due to the arrangement of the properties the extension would project a significant distance along the boundary with the rear garden of No 16. Due to the height and massing of the extension as well as its proximity to the boundary, it would appear as an overdominant and oppressive feature in views from the rear elevation and garden of No 16. Although the extension would be set back from the boundary with No 16, this would not be sufficient to mitigate for the identified harm.
12. Due to its massing and proximity, the proposal would be an overdominant and oppressive feature in relation to the rear elevation and garden of No 16, and would lead to significant harm to the living conditions of residents of that property with regard to outlook. The proposal would therefore conflict with the amenity requirements of Policy DS5 of the Core Strategy. The proposal would also conflict with the advice of the SPD regarding the amenity of neighbouring residents.

Conclusion

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

David Cross

INSPECTOR