



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2025

by E Fawcett BA (Jt Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/25/3372036

49 Lichfield Mount, Bradford BD2 1NX

- 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 R M Al-Tamimi against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01420/HOU.
 - The development proposed is described as removal of existing roof and addition of new floor above existing bungalow. Including new two storey side extension including car port below. New single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a modestly proportioned detached bungalow, located in a residential area comprising a mix of mostly single and two-storey dwellings. It lies at the end of a row of bungalows, many of which are semi-detached, which rise gradually in height up Lichfield Mount. On the other side of the appeal property is a larger two-storey building containing apartments which is set back from the road with a parking area to the front. The small proportions and staggered roof arrangement of the row of bungalows responds effectively to the ascending landform, establishing a harmonious visual rhythm. Due to their low profile, the roofs of these properties form a key feature within the street scene.
4. The proposed development would significantly extend the bungalow, both in terms of its height and width, creating a substantially larger two-storey dwelling. The resulting gable fronting the highway would be considerably wider and higher than at present, visually dominating the adjacent single storey property and interrupting the visual rhythm of the row of bungalows. The distance between the first-floor windows in the front elevation would accentuate its horizontal emphasis. Consequently, the resulting building would appear visually dominant and incongruous within the street scene, particularly when viewed in the foreground of the adjacent bungalows.
5. The open sides to the car port would further exacerbate the harm caused by the proposal, creating an unbalanced and top-heavy appearance to the dwelling.

Bradford's Householder Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) highlights that such features are likely to be unacceptable. Section 3 of the SPD (page 29) states that the relationship of the open sides with the solid walling at first floor will be unbalanced and will normally be out of keeping with the character of the original house and wider area.

6. I note that there are varying designs of houses within the surrounding area and other two-storey buildings in the vicinity of the site, including properties that have been previously extended, as highlighted by the appellant. The adjacent apartment building is particularly large compared to the surrounding properties, although the set-back provided by the parking area to the front reduces its prominence within the street scene and sets it apart from the row of bungalows containing the appeal property. This building is also unique in its design in this locality, being generally larger than the dwellings in the vicinity of the site and having an unusual roof configuration, so does not represent the prevailing character of the area.
7. No 22 lies opposite the appeal property and has been significantly extended, resulting in a large two storey dwelling. Whilst it is near the appeal site, this building stands on its own within a corner plot, fronting onto the lower part of Lichfield Mount, rather than forming part of the row of bungalows that follow the rising landform. Its context is therefore different to the appeal property. Although the dwelling at No 22 is large, it does not include the same design features as the appeal proposal that would result in harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the area.
8. Nos 25 and 27 lie on the lower section of Lichfield Mount and have been extended upward but still retain the appearance of bungalows at the front, with dormer windows in the roof slopes. Therefore, the appeal proposal differs to these examples both in terms of the design and the position within the street. Whilst I acknowledge that there have been changes to properties in the surrounding area, the purpose of policies DS1 and DS3 of Bradford District's Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2017 (Local Plan) is not to resist change but to ensure that new developments contribute to achieving good design and high-quality places and therefore are relevant to the appeal proposal.
9. Therefore, for the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area and would conflict with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Local Plan, which seek to ensure that development achieves good design and a strong sense of place and responds to the existing positive patterns of development which contribute to the character of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

E Fawcett

INSPECTOR