
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 February 2017

by **B.Hellier BA(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 28th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/16/3165688
105 Moore Avenue, Bradford, BD6 3HU

- 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 Mr and Mrs Waseem Sarwar against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/07258/HOU, dated 23 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is a retrospective application for two-storey extension to side, single-storey extension to rear and double garage with porch to front and dormer window to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background

2. The appeal property is a semi-detached house. In 2011 planning permission was granted for a two storey side extension together with a single storey rear extension. The development now constructed does not follow the approved plans. There are various minor changes but, most significantly, the hipped roof to the side of the property has become a standard gable and on the enlarged roof slope to the rear a box dormer window has been inserted.
3. The present application has been submitted to regularise the position and to secure approval for the extension as constructed. The description of development in the submitted application makes no reference to the box dormer and hip to gable extension because the appellants considered it to be permitted development. However they concede in the grounds of appeal that it is not. The Council has treated it as being an integral part of the proposal. I consider this to be a sensible approach and I have amended the development description to reflect this.

Main issue

4. I consider the main issue is the effect of the dormer window and associated roof alterations on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The box dormer runs virtually the full width of the original dwelling, extends to the height of the main ridge and is inset less than 20cm from the eaves. It

gives a top heavy appearance to the property and creates a cramped and rather oppressive environment within the small tapering rear garden. Its bulk is emphasised by white plastic cladding. Horizontal window openings have no regard to the scale and proportions of those on the rear wall. To the front of the house the loss of the hipped roof has destroyed the symmetry with the attached dwelling in the semi-detached pair.

6. At present trees screen much of the front of the house from the road but they are not protected and not all within the plot boundary. There is no guarantee they will be retained. It is also the case that the rear elevation is not readily seen from the public domain. Nonetheless it is visible from the rear windows and gardens of properties in Enfield Parade and Kenley Mount.
7. I find that the box dormer and hip to gable alteration to the main roof has a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It conflicts with Policy D1 of the Unitary Development Plan (UDP)¹ which requires proposals to be well related to the existing character of the locality in terms of design, scale, massing, height and materials. Design guidance for house extensions² acknowledges that often rear box dormers are permitted development but where they are not they should be no more than 3m wide, positioned below the ridge and back from the wall. The box dormer fails to satisfy the UDP and design guide criteria.
8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Bern Hellier

INSPECTOR

¹ Replacement Unitary Development Plan for the Bradford District. Adopted October 2005

² Householder Supplementary Planning Guidance. Adopted April 2012