



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/25/3369077

91 Leeds Road, Eccleshill, Bradford BD2 3AZ

- 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 Mrs Akhtar against the decision of the City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 25/01357/HOU.
 - The development proposed is single storey extension to side and rear and porch and ramp to front for disability adaption (Part Retrospective) and installation of decking and fence
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. At the time of my site visit, I observed that the development had commenced. The application has been submitted in part retrospectively; I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the development on the living conditions of occupiers of No. 89 Leeds Road, No. 4 Leafield Terrace and No. 6 Leafield Terrace.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached property within a predominantly residential area. I understand that a previous application was approved at the appeal site for a single storey extension to side and rear and porch and ramp to front¹.
5. The proposal before me would revise the previously approved scheme by: increased the height and profile of roof of rear extension; removal of 1.No window from southern elevation of side extension; insertion of 2.No new sets of large glazed doors into rear garden; adjusted position of 3.No rear extension skylights; installation of new steps, decking and boundary fence to the rear and 1.No new window in easternmost elevation of rear extension.
6. The Council do not raise concern relating to the proposed front porch or the access ramp, from the information before me I agree.

¹ LPA Ref: 23/04733/HOU

7. The appeal property has a small area of private amenity space to the rear due to the footprint of the proposed development which I understand has not changed from that previously approved. The bulk of the side and rear extension was substantially complete at the time of my site visit.
8. Although some overlooking occurred from the original rear elevation windows prior to the commencement of works, the proposed development introduces a significantly greater extent of glazing than that previously approved. In particular, two sets of glazed doors opening onto a proposed raised patio area, along with a window in the rear elevation of the development. Whilst the proposed boundary fencing would screen to a degree the development I am not convinced that this would prevent overlooking.
9. Properties to the east are situated at a lower level to the appeal site. As a consequence of this ground level difference, the raised decking along with the amount of glazing would allow unrestricted views into the private amenity spaces of adjacent properties.
10. The increased height of the development compared with the previously approved scheme, together with alterations to the roof form, results in a dominant and elevated structure that is overbearing and oppressive to the occupiers of neighbouring properties.
11. I find that due to the scale, design and proximity of the development to the neighbouring properties the proposal before me would be dominant form of development which exacerbates overlooking harming the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 89 Leeds Road, No. 4 Leafield Terrace and No. 6 Leafield Terrace.
12. I conclude that there is conflict with Policy DS5 of the Local Plan for Bradford District, Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017) which amongst other things seeks to protect the amenity of existing or prospective residents.
13. There is also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) which seeks to ensure developments have high standards of amenity for existing and future users.

Other Matters

14. The application form states that the development is for disability adaptation. I have not been provided with evidence to substantiate this. Nevertheless, the previous approval would provide a similar development to meet any need as such I give this limited weight.

Conclusion

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

C Pipe

INSPECTOR