



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2017

by Darren Hendley BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/17/3173150
19 Shay Drive, Bradford BD9 5PP

- 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 A Qayyum against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/09063/HOU, dated 12 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is a hip to gable roof and construction of dormer windows to front and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises of a two storey detached dwelling located on a prominent plot at the corner of Shay Drive and Shay Fold. The roof is hipped and pyramidal in form, with a front gable as an integral feature. The property is also at noticeably higher land levels to Shay Drive.
4. The area is residential in character. Hipped roofs and front gables are a pleasing feature of the detached and semi-detached houses near to the appeal property. Where roof alterations have taken place, they have maintained this appearance. Further along Shay Drive, to the east, are a greater mix of properties with a terrace and bungalows. These are however separated from the appeal site by the road layout, and have their own character and appearance.
5. The proposed hip to gable would result in the loss of the hipped roof form of the property. The increased height and width of the main roof would add considerably to its bulk and massing, and make it appear out of proportion with the existing structure, including the main front gable. The cohesiveness of the design of the roof with front gable would be significantly reduced.
6. The proposed two front dormers would be located prominently on the front roof slope. Their glazed front elevations would appear discordant with the tile form

of the roof and, although they would roughly line up with the first floor windows, their vertical form would be in contrast to the horizontal arrangement of the majority of the windows on the front elevation. Their gables would also be of greater height than the front gable, so they would further detract from its prominence, rather than appearing to compliment it.

7. Side gable ends and front dormers are not a feature of the houses nearest the appeal property. As the proposals would not be in keeping with these roof forms, this would disrupt their uniformity, and this would significantly detract from their appearance. The location and elevated position of the property would also result in the proposals appearing highly prominent in the streetscene, particularly, when approaching from the east along Shay Drive. The proposals would therefore appear highly dominant in the streetscene and this prominence would serve to increase their incongruous form.
8. The Local Development Framework for Bradford Householder Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD) specifically states that, as proposed, an extension with a gable roof is unlikely to look right on a house with a hipped roof. Whilst the dormers have sought to follow the design principles in the SPD concerning the maximum width and the cladding of the side walls in tiles to match the roof, they do not compliment the window proportions of the property. The SPD is also clear it is vital that any roof extensions or alterations are to be carefully considered. The proposals would not achieve this due to their prominent and discordant form.
9. I conclude that the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the building and the area. It would therefore not comply with 'Saved' Policies UR3 and D1 of the City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council – Replacement Unitary Development Plan for the Bradford District (2005) which requires that development does not have an adverse effect on the surrounding environment and provides a high quality design, including that it is well related to the character of the locality.

Conclusion

10. I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Darren Hendley

INSPECTOR