



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2026

by N Teasdale BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/25/3375340

18 Bradford Road, Idle, Bradford BD10 9PE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Lee Farrow against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01374/HOU.
 - The development proposed is outbuilding constructed to the front of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The works as described in the above banner heading has already taken place on site. I have determined this appeal on a retrospective basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a semi-detached dwelling at 18 Bradford Road. The property has a stone exterior under a slate tiled roof, located on a street with similar property types.
5. The proposed development seeks retrospective planning permission for an outbuilding to the front of the property. External materials comprise white composite cladding with a black membrane roof. It has a single UPVC access door to the side and a window facing back towards the host dwelling.
6. The outbuilding is located to the front of the property where such additions are usually resisted under the Householder Supplementary Design Guide (SDG). It is close to the shared boundary with the neighbouring property No 20 Bradford Road. Whilst set back from Bradford Road itself, the outbuilding is still highly visible in the street scene and is prominently sited to the front of the property. It is excessive in size, and its light-coloured materials result in the building appearing as an incongruous feature particularly from Bradford Road and from within the surrounding courtyard of residential properties. It also contrasts with the stone-fronted appearance of the built form surrounding the site which further exacerbates the harm. Overall, I find that such a large prominent structure to the front of the property appears alien and at odds with the character of the street scene. In

coming to such findings, I have had regard to existing landscaping features/boundary treatments as well as the orientation of the property to the highway, but this would not alter my findings as the outbuilding is still highly visible from public vantage points.

7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development unacceptably harms the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It therefore conflicts with Policies DS1 and DS5 of the Core Strategy, 2017 which together, amongst other matters, seeks to achieve good design. For the same reasons, the development conflicts with the SDG.
8. I appreciate that the images provided in the SDG are not directly comparable to the appeal site. However, this is simply an illustration of types of development considered to be acceptable and not acceptable opposed to an exhaustive list. The purpose of the SDG, amongst others, is to ensure that proposals are well designed and complement or enhance the character of the original property and the wider area. In assessing this proposal on its own merits, I do not consider the scheme to achieve this purpose.

Other Matters

9. The Officer's report sets out that a degree of detrimental overbearing, overshadowing and loss of outlook on No 20 Bradford Road results from the outbuilding. It also raises concern regarding loss of privacy from the front-facing window. However, this is not specifically included in the reasoning for refusal as set out on the decision notice. Given that I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, I do not find it necessary for me to discuss this matter further.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

N Teasdale

INSPECTOR