



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2025

by **C Evans MTCP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/25/3374882

12 High Spring Gardens Lane, Keighley, West Yorkshire BD20 6JT

- 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 M Hussain against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/02397/HOU.
 - The development proposed is single-storey extension to front with canopy roof, increase dual pitched section of roof to same height as central gable and part two- part single-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description for the proposal on the application form does not include alterations to the front elevation. The Council revised the description to include this element. The alterations are clearly shown on the plans before me and so I consider the proposal to be as described in the decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the host dwelling.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is one of a pair of semi-detached dwellings in a predominantly residential area. Neighbouring properties are mostly semi-detached, some of which have been altered and include two storey side extensions. They are setback from the road on a similar build line, with large spacing between some plots. Little has been altered to the front elevation of the host and adjoining dwelling, resulting in a mostly symmetrical appearance.
5. A large extension to the side and rear is proposed. It is around 5m in width and includes a small single storey addition to the front of the dwelling, which would project beyond the current build line of the front elevation. The proposal would increase the ridge height of the existing roof to that of the current central gable. The proposed side extension would also be to this increased ridge height. As a result, it would be overbearing and overwhelm the host property and would not appear to be subservient.
6. The proposed alterations to the front elevation, which also include the loss of the existing porch, would significantly alter the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached

dwelling. In combination with the substantial mass and increase in ridge height of the proposal, it would be discordant in appearance with the area.

7. The significant scale and mass of the proposal would largely fill the current gap between the host dwelling and the boundary with 10 High Spring Gardens Lane, which would negatively impact the spacious appearance of this part of the streetscape.
8. The Council has drawn my attention to the Householder Supplementary Planning Document. It advises that integrated extensions, such as this proposal, are not appropriate for semi-detached dwellings. Subordinate extensions are considered more appropriate. It also advises that side extensions should be setback from their host dwelling. The proposal would not comply with these guidelines.
9. The appellant contends that the visual impact is limited as the property is set back from the main highway and is screened by hedging. The mass of the proposed extension would be clearly visible above the hedge from various viewpoints along High Spring Gardens Lane. The hedge, therefore, would not mitigate against the effect on the character and appearance of the area.
10. The materials proposed would match the host dwelling. Whilst this complies with Policy DS3 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2017 (Core Strategy), it would not overcome the harm to the character and appearance of the area and adjoining dwelling as described above.
11. The appellant has drawn my attention to other properties in the area, which have side extensions. Very limited information has been given to me regarding these properties, and so I am not aware of the circumstances under which they were developed. During my site visit, I observed two storey side extensions on nearby properties. The majority are clearly subservient in nature due to their setback from the build line and have a lower ridge line when compared to their host property. No 4 is the exception to this, but occupies a clearly visible corner plot with differences in design. They are not comparable to this proposal, and in any case, I must determine this appeal on its merits.
12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the host dwelling. It conflicts with policies DS1 and DS3 of the Core Strategy, which seek to ensure proposals are appropriate to their context and contribute to the character of the area.

Conclusion

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

C Evans

INSPECTOR