
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 February 2026 by S Manson DipTP MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/25/3376379

2 Bevan Court, Bradford BD7 4RT

- 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 Arch Design Studios against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/02317/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as a “doubled storied rear extension and front entrance”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

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 scheme, which seeks retrospective planning permission.
3. The suggested additional proposed side elevation drawings have not been submitted. The appeal should not be used to evolve a scheme in any event. What is considered should be the same as was by the Council and interested parties at the application stage. I have determined the appeal based on the original plans: Location Plan; Ground Floor Plan 2502 AR 03; First Floor Plan 2502 AR 04; Detail Entrance 2502 AR 05; Detail 1 Entrance 2502 AR 05; Detail Kitchen 2502 AR 06; Detail 1 Kitchen 2502 AR 07; Elevations 2502 AR 08 and Elevations 2502 AR 09.

Preliminary Matter and Main Issue

4. The Council do not object to the porch, and I have no reason to disagree. I have therefore focussed on the rear two-storey extension. The main issue in regard to which is its effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of Number 4 Bevan Close (No. 4), with specific regard to outlook and light; and Number 38 Hollybank Road (No. 38) with specific regard to privacy.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a detached dwelling in a small cul-de-sac comprising similarly scaled detached and semi-detached dwellings. There is a relatively narrow separation between the appeal property and No. 4, with both benefitting from modest south-western rear gardens. Boundary treatments generally consist of close-boarded timber fencing. To the rear, properties on Hollybank Road sit on a higher ground level and look over the appeal site and its neighbours.

6. The Householder Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (SPD) advises that development should avoid unacceptable impacts on neighbouring occupiers in respect of privacy, over-dominance and loss of natural light. Two-storey extensions should not normally project beyond a 45-degree line taken from the edge of the nearest habitable window of an adjacent property.
7. Given the scale and design of the extension and its close proximity to the shared boundary with No. 4, it fails to accord with this guidance. The substantial and uninterrupted expanse of brickwork presents as a visually dominant and enclosing feature when experienced from the adjoining garden. Resulting in an oppressive and overbearing form that unacceptably diminishes the quality of outlook for the occupiers of No. 4. Owing to the south-western orientation and the height and depth of the extension, it will cast additional shadow over the ground-floor windows of No. 4 later in the day and towards sunset. Thus, perceptibly and unacceptably, reducing light to these rooms. The submitted sun-path diagrams do not provide persuasive evidence that this impact would be negligible.
8. To the rear, the extension marginally reduces the separation distance with No. 38, below that recommended in the SPD. Due to the elevated position of No. 38 and intervening distance, I am satisfied that its occupiers will continue to enjoy a good standard of privacy. That said, and for the above reasons, the appeal scheme unacceptably harms the living conditions of the occupants of No. 4, with specific regard to outlook and light. It is thus contrary to Policy DS5 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2017. Amongst other things, this seeks to ensure that development does not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. The development as built does not correspond with the submitted plans. The constructed rear extension features a full gable roof rather than hipped and the drawings appear to include an additional flat section and gable header above one of the windows. The positions of the patio doors and windows differ, and the porch is a larger gabled structure. Even if I had found no harm on the main issue, one could not recommend allowing the appeal as there would be no accurate plans to tie it to. By the internal space in use, it is reasonable to conclude that there is no intention by the appellant to rebuild it in accordance with the submitted drawings.
10. The appeal scheme conflicts with the development plan and material considerations do not indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

S Manson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR