



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 July 2019 by L Wilson BA (Hons) MA

Decision by A U Ghafoor BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/18/3217824

11 Kingswood Street, Bradford, BD7 3DU

- 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 Hameed Said against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 18/03955/HOU, dated 12 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 6 November 2018.
 - The development proposed is for two dormer windows to the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. Development has already been carried out. The main issue is whether the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Great Horton Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. No. 11 is a later nineteenth-century mill-worker's terrace. The terrace is a typical through back. It is simple in form with chimneys, slate roofs, eaves bands, cills and lintels. Dormer windows are not characteristic of the properties. Within the street there are other similar terraces which creates a strong rhythm. Towards Kingswood Terrace there is a newer terrace which displays similar characteristics. The Council highlight that the Great Horton Conservation Area Assessment (2006) concludes that dormers have blighted the appearance of the properties and streets concerned. Other alterations such as modern windows and painted facade have also altered the character of the street.
5. The front dormers occupy a large amount of the roof space and are located close to the eaves. Plans have been submitted that indicate the current white cladding would be replaced by tiles to match the house. Whilst this would improve the appearance of the dormers, the latter cause visual harm to the external appearance of the host building and block because of their overall

height and scale. The dormers have a lack of alignment with the original fenestration and detract from the appearance of no. 11.

6. In addition, this design and type of dormer window is not characteristic of the terrace or street scene. Given the location of the dormers, and proximity to the eaves, they are a bulky addition to the roof and appear disproportionate. The dormers are located to the front roof slope and are clearly visible from public vantages. They have altered the character of the uninterrupted and simplistic architectural style of the block to the detriment of the character of the CA.
7. It is contended that there are other dormers within the street. However, these do not set a precedent and the Council state that none of these appear to have been approved. Roof extensions cannot be directly compared as no. 11 is set within a terrace which does not contain any dormers. In any event, the dormers on the opposite terrace confirm that dormer extensions alter the nature of uninterrupted roofscapes, to the detriment of the CA's character.
8. The harm caused is less than substantial given the location of the site, nevertheless it is of considerable importance and weight. This harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. No evidence has been submitted to show any public benefits. The proposal therefore causes harm that is not justified or outweighed, as required by the Framework.
9. I find that the development does not, and would not, preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Accordingly, the development would fail to comply with Policies DS1, DS3, EN3 and SC9 of the Local Plan for the Bradford District Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017) and the policy found in the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

L M Wilson

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I too agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

A U Ghafoor

INSPECTOR