



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2025 by A Morrison MTCP MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/25/3364795

3 East Parade, Menston LS29 6NW

- 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 Gohir Rashid against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/04540/HOU.
 - The development proposed was originally described as a double storey side extension and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. Notwithstanding the description of development set out above, which is taken from the application form, it is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the proposal also comprises the erection of front and rear dormer windows in connection with the loft conversion, the formation of a new vehicular access onto East Parade with associated parking area and the demolition of an existing garage. The Council dealt with the proposal on this basis, and I shall do the same.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are;
 - The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area; and,
 - The effect of the proposed development upon highway safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site is a detached dwelling prominently sited on an open corner plot at the entrance to Wentworth Close. Together with surrounding properties, which though vary in their individual design, are collectively of a similar style, the house retains its main original scale, including a gabled roof which has not been enlarged

and a simple palette of materials. These shared features contribute to the locality's orderly, suburban character.

6. Against this context, the proposed extensions to the appeal dwelling would introduce substantial new mass and associated discordant forms that would not respect the existing modest proportions and simple exterior. By virtue of its steeply pitched projecting front gable, contrasting window heights and double garage door, the side extension would not respect the style of the existing house and furthermore would not be subordinate in its scale. The narrow front dormers together with the wide box-like rear dormer, would individually and cumulatively appear as incongruous enlargements to the building's roof, contributing to a jumbled aesthetic at the front and a top-heavy three storey scale at the back. Whilst the use of matching materials would help to assimilate the proposals, this would not overcome the harm caused to the appearance of the host dwelling through their unsympathetic design and excessive bulk.
7. Significantly, given its corner positioning, the existing house retains its original set back building lines to the adjacent highways to its front and side. Neighbouring dwellings along Wentworth Close to the rear of the appeal site initially follow this same building line, before the road curves. The consistency in the arrangement of this run of properties to the road affords this part of the street scene a collective rhythm and spaciousness which is key to its character.
8. I observed that the proposed side extension, through its siting close to the highway and considerable overall scale, would violate the uniformity of this building line, in doing so forming a sizeable blocking mass that would reduce the open aspect of the street scene. The conspicuous corner location of the dwelling at the entrance to this no-through road would serve to exacerbate the extension's unduly dominant appearance as a projection harmfully at odds with the well-established pattern of development. In addition, because dormer windows are not a prevalent feature to the detached dwellings within the vicinity of the site, the additions of these volumes to the building's roof would fail to reflect the prevailing character of the locality.
9. For these reasons, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and area. The appeal scheme conflicts with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Bradford District Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2017, which together seek for development to be of a good quality design that responds to the positive characteristics of its area, through being appropriate to its context in terms of layout, scale and details. The development is also contrary to the guidance set out within the Bradford Householder Supplementary Planning Document 2012, in which Principle 1 advises that the size, position and form of extensions and dormer windows should maintain or improve the character and quality of the original house and wider area.

Highway safety

10. The appeal site's sole existing vehicular access is located towards its rear, adjoining Wentworth Close. The scheme includes the demolition of a detached single garage associated with this rear access, together with the formation of a new vehicular access at the property's frontage onto East Parade, along with associated curtilage parking including a new integral double garage.
11. The proposed new access is shown to be constructed in part over the curved pavement in front of the proposed garage, and therefore over part of the bell mouth

at Wentworth Close's junction with East Parade. Though I note the appellant's suggestion that the access could be adjusted to avoid the radius kerb, I have dealt with the plans before me, and as were determined by the Council. I note the concerns raised by the Council's Highway Engineer over the lack of alignment between the positioning of the access and the garage. In this regard I agree that the awkwardness of this layout would potentially lead both to practical difficulties with garage parking, but more consequently, vehicle movements directly over the radius kerb around the highway junction.

12. However, even if the access was used solely as shown, its immediate proximity as adjoining the bell mouth junction is such that this would give rise to the potential for conflict between vehicles manoeuvring across the access, including in a reverse gear due to the absence of a turning space, and vehicles manoeuvring into and out of Wentworth Close from or to East Parade. Such a conflict would introduce an unacceptable and heightened level of hazard to the highway safety of motorists.
13. I therefore conclude that the appeal scheme's proposed access and parking would be of an unsatisfactory layout, because of an insufficient separation of the new access from the highway junction giving rise to potential adverse effects upon highway safety. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies DS1 and DS4 of the Bradford District Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2017, which together seek for development to take a holistic approach to design, including through providing car parking that supports the street scene and pedestrian environment whilst also being convenient and secure. Additionally, I have had due regard to the Framework, which indicates that development should be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Other Matters

14. The appellant's evidence refers to prominent gabled forms at nearby properties 11 East Parade and 15 Wentworth Close. The appeal scheme, which has been assessed on its own merits, is however not closely comparable to either of these properties, due to both spatial considerations and differences in scale and design. Whilst double storey side extensions at two additional properties have also been referenced, these are too distant from the appeal site to contribute to the character of the area.
15. I note the appellant's comments regarding the variety of boundary treatments fronting Wentworth Close, however, these are subordinate features to the foremost presence of the uniform set back building line, as is described above. By virtue of the side extension's prominent positioning and massing, I observed that it would significantly obstruct existing sightlines into and out of Wentworth Close, in doing so harming the character of the street scene as is associated with this regularity and spaciousness. Though I also note the willingness to incorporate boundary landscaping, this would not resolve the fundamental incompatibility of the appeal scheme with its locality.
16. The proposed site plan indicates the erection of a picket fence along the appeal site's boundaries adjacent to the highway and the appellant contends that the installation of such would improve the safety and security of the property. Subject to obtaining any required planning permission for such a development, this is a potential benefit that could however equally be achieved independent of the harmful proposed extensions, and therefore I afford this no material weight.

17. Though I note the appellant's evidence regarding on-street vehicle parking around the road junction and agree that this is unsatisfactory, this does not provide a compelling justification for the proposed new access, which is inappropriately located for the reasons given above. At the time of my visit, I also observed that the reversing of vehicles onto Wentworth Close is an established common practice and therefore do not consider that the closure of the appeal site's existing access onto this no-through road would give rise to any material benefits.

Conclusion and Recommendation

18. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Morrison

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

19. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR