



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2025

by **Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/25/3374238

230 Park Lane, Keighley, Bradford BD21 4RL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Huggy Osman against the decision of the City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 25/01959/HOU.
 - The development proposed is single-storey garage to rear with extended garden area above, two-storey side extension, single-storey rear extension, hip to gable roof conversion and front and rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council changed the description of development from that referenced in the application form. In the interests of clarity, I have adopted the revised description of development.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the development on (i) the character and appearance of the area; and (ii) the living conditions of occupiers of No. 1 Glenhurst Grove.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached property which is located on a corner plot on the junction of Park Lane and Glenhurst Grove within a predominantly residential area. The appeal site is in an elevated position on both Park Lane and Glenhurst Grove. The area comprises a mix of property styles, however within the immediate area semi-detached properties which share common features are prevalent.
5. The proposed dormer windows would be large additions to both the front and rear of the property. The rear dormer occupies most of the roof slope and both dormers are level with the ridge of the roof. I observed during my site visit that were not a common feature in the area.
6. The Council confirm that the hip to gable alteration would benefit from permitted development rights under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted

Development) (England) Order 2015, as amended. The appellant also contends the dormers can be building under permitted development rights, I have not been provided with substantive evidence for instance in the form of a certificate of lawful development to assess what alterations could take place under permitted development rights, as such I give this limited weight.

7. Whilst the Council consider that the front dormer complies with the Local Development Framework for Bradford, Householder Supplementary Development Plan Document (the SPD) in terms its 3m width, the SPD also stipulates that dormers should be set below the ridge line. The proposed front dormer does not meet this requirement. The rear dormer exceeds 3 metres in width and is likewise not positioned below the ridge. Accordingly, neither dormer complies with the provisions of the SPD.
8. The scale and design of the dormers combined with the hip to gable alteration would result in a pronounced imbalance to the shared features of the appeal property and its attached neighbour creating a form that is incongruous with the character of the wider area.
9. The proposed wrap-around extension would constitute a substantial enlargement of the property. In addition, the raised garden would appear prominent and out of keeping with the established streetscene. Overall, the massing and design of the extensions and terrace would be visually dominant and would overwhelm the modest character of the existing dwelling.
10. Due to the elevated position of the appeal property on a corner plot, the proposed development would be obvious in the streetscene. The design would be at odds with the surrounding area as such I find that the development would harm the character and appearance of the area.
11. In relation to the main issue relating to character and appearance, there is conflict with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Local Plan for Bradford District, Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017) (the Local Plan) and the SPD which seeks amongst other things that developments are of good design and are appropriate to the surrounding area.

Living Conditions

12. The SPD states that decking, terraces, and balconies should be positioned at least 7 metres from any boundary adjoining a neighbour's private garden, in order to preserve acceptable standards of amenity and privacy. The proposed raised garden would be located directly along the boundary shared with No. 1 Glenhurst Grove. Although these requirements serve as guidelines, I have been presented with no substantive justification for departing from them.
13. Whilst overlooking already occurs from windows within the rear elevation of the appeal property, No. 1 is situated at a lower level to the appeal site, due to this level difference the proposed development would have views towards a side first floor window and into the private amenity space of No. 1.
14. The appellant states that the mature boundary hedge and fence between the appeal site and No. 1 would be retained. However, during my site visit I observed that these features would not provide effective screening. The appellant also proposes conditions to retain the landscaping and install a screen along the edge of

the raised garden. I am not convinced that these measures would prevent overlooking, and I consider that such screening would instead create an undue sense of enclosure for the occupants of No. 1, resulting in an overbearing form of development.

15. I find that due to the scale, design and elevated position the proposed development would be dominant and exacerbate overlooking to the detriment of the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 1 Glenhurst Grove.
16. In relation to the main issue relating to living conditions, I conclude that there is conflict with Policy DS5 of the Local Plan and the SPD which amongst other things seeks to protect the amenity of existing or prospective residents.

Conclusion

17. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR