
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2017

by Katie McDonald MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/17/3175000
148 Wilmer Road, Bradford BD9 4AH

- 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 Shahid Hussain against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00643/HOU, dated 7 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 4 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is a roof conversion with dormer windows to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The development description on the planning application form is 'roof conversion with dormer windows to the front & rear'. The plans subject to the appeal do not feature dormer windows to the front (drawing number P01 Revision A). I have amended the description of development in my banner heading above. I am also aware from the submitted plans that the proposal involves changing the hips on the roof to gable ends. I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the Heaton Estates Conservation Area and the host dwelling.

Reasons

4. The dwelling is a detached house set within the Heaton Estates Conservation Area. It features a hipped roof with two chimneys, rendered walling, and due to the topography of the site, is two storeys to the front and three storeys to the rear.
5. The significance of the conservation area is derived from its exclusive residential and estate development, predominantly built over Victorian and Edwardian periods, reflecting the affluence of Bradford at the time. Plot sizes are spacious and there is established and mature tree cover in the area. The contribution of the dwelling to the conservation area is moderate, being of no particular architectural or historic importance. It features as a subservient building to the adjacent large villas which are key unlisted buildings. However, as required by Policy BH7 of the City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council

Replacement Unitary Development Plan for the Bradford District, Policy Framework (October 2005) (DP) proposals are expected to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas.

6. The dwelling sits between three storey stone Victorian residential villas to the north and two storey semi-detached dwellings to the south. The semi-detached dwellings are of a similar design to the existing appeal property, albeit with dual pitched roofs. The appeal proposal seeks to alter the roof form from hipped to dual pitched with an increase in the ridge height. Additionally, a rear dormer window is proposed and roof lights to the front.
7. The Bradford Householder Supplementary Planning Document (April 2012) (SPD) requires that rear dormers are no wider than 3m to reduce their dominance. Whilst being guidance only, it gives a good indication of an appropriate size for a subordinate dormer window. The dormer proposed would be almost 6m wide spanning the whole of the rear roof slope. It would also have a flat roof and consequently it would appear wide and boxy, resulting in an overly dominant and disproportionate addition. Furthermore, the horizontal emphasis fenestration design would relate poorly to the host dwelling, which features windows of a vertical emphasis. I find that these elements combined are incongruous and would result in a harmful addition to the host dwelling.
8. I note that the prominence of the rear elevation is less than the front; however, the site is within a conservation area, where design, which would include roofscapes, is required to be of the highest standard to safeguard the valuable resource, as set out in Policy BH7 of the DP.
9. The introduction of a dual pitched roof, together with the rear dormer and increase in ridge height would dramatically alter the appearance of the dwelling and its setting within the conservation area. The proposal would be a prominent and significant change in the street scene and roofscape, which I consider would be dominant and out of keeping.
10. The appellant's agent states that the dormer materials would be tile hung, and as such I do not consider that there would be excessive cladding. However, my conclusions on the design would not be outweighed by the use of acceptable materials.
11. Consequently, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Heaton Estates Conservation Area, contrary to saved Policies BH7, D1 and UR3 of the DP which require the highest standards of design; and the SPD for the reason I have set out above.

Other Matters

12. I have noted the appellant's requirement for additional space for his family; however, this personal circumstance does not outweigh the significant harm I have found to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. The statutory duty in Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is a matter of considerable importance and weight. The proposal would harm the significance of the Heaton Estates Conservation Area, leading to 'less than substantial harm' as set out in the

National Planning Policy Framework. There are no public benefits that would outweigh the identified harm.

14. Having had regard to all other matters raised, and for the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Katie McDonald

INSPECTOR