



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2019

by F Cullen BA(Hons) MSc DipTP MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/19/3229726

81 Moorhead Lane, Shipley BD18 4JW

- 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 T Mitchell against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01286/HOU, dated 19 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is a new dormer window to east and south elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a new dormer window to east and south elevation at 81 Moorhead Lane, Shipley BD18 4JW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/01286/HOU, dated 19 March 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 2389/01/00 Site Location Plan; 2389/01/01 Existing Plans, Section and Elevations; and 2389/01/0P3 Proposed Plans, Section and Elevations – New Dormer to East and South Elevations.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed dormer window on the character and appearance of the host building and the wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located on the western side of Moorhead Lane in a prominent corner plot at the junction with Moorhead Terrace. It forms the left hand half of a substantial semi-detached, two storey Victorian villa dating from the 1880s. It is constructed of coursed natural stone with a Welsh slate roof.
4. The dwellings in the immediately surrounding area vary in form and design but are generally consistent in their materials of stone and slate which gives a

degree of visual harmony to the street scene. The majority are set back from the road, are situated within generous plots with extensive planting and mature tree cover and are enclosed to the front by substantial stone boundary walls. The strong linear boundary treatment and mature landscaping to the gardens combine to provide a formal character but pleasing verdant appearance to the area.

5. I am aware that the Council on 7 May 2019 granted planning permission for the construction of a new dormer window to the east elevation of the building¹. This was for a dormer window with a glazed portion of 2.6m in width, set back 1m from the eaves and sited 0.4m below the ridge of the roof. This dormer window was considered to be acceptable in terms of design and its impact on the character of the host building and the street scene. There is no question that the extant permission could be implemented and, therefore, represents a fallback position against which to assess the proposed dormer window.
6. The proposed dormer window would be a box design with a flat roof and in a L-shape that would span the valley between the roof pitch of the east elevation and the roof pitch of the south elevation. It would have dormer faces of 2m in width on the east elevation and 1m in width on the south elevation, set back 1m from the eaves and sited 0.4m below the ridge of the roof on the east elevation and 1.3m below the ridge on the higher portion of the roof on the south elevation. The cheeks of the proposed dormer window would be clad in grey slates to match the roof of the host building with any other details finished in dark grey.
7. I recognise that the proposed dormer window would be more complex in its form and more visible in long range views from Moorhead Lane when looking north than the consented dormer window. However, given its modest size and scale relative to the existing roofscape, I am of the opinion that it would not be an overly large or dominant feature, and consider that it would be just as prominent as the consented dormer window in short range views from Moorhead Lane when looking north and north west.
8. Furthermore, I acknowledge that, in terms of its L-shape, flat roof and box design, the proposed dormer window would be a very modern addition to the existing roof. However, I consider that the use of matching materials would allow it to integrate with the existing roofscape, and that it would not appear any more of an intrusive or incongruous feature on the roof than the consented dormer window. In these respects, the proposed dormer window would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building or the wider street scene.
9. I noted on my site visit that, although the proposed dormer window would be noticeable in views from Moorhead Lane when looking north or north west, due to the limited width and slight gradient of the road down to the north, it would not be possible to read the proposed dormer window in the context of the symmetry of the semi-detached pair of dwellings. On this basis it would not visually unbalance the pair of dwellings.
10. I acknowledge that the proposed dormer window would not technically adhere to all of the design principles relating to dormer windows stated within the Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (Householder

¹ 19/01285/HOU

SPD). However, it is apparent that the appeal property does not conform to the common types of buildings illustrated in the Householder SPD. Therefore, in line with the flexibility provided within the Householder SPD, I consider it appropriate that the proposed dormer window is judged on its own merits.

11. In determining the appeal I have had regard to the appellant's fallback position and the fact that the consented dormer window and the proposed dormer window could not be implemented together. Taking all of the above into account, I conclude that the proposed dormer window would not significantly harm the character and appearance of the host building and the wider street scene. As such, it would not conflict with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the adopted Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2017 which, together, require development proposals to contribute to achieving good design and high quality places, create a strong sense of place and be appropriate to their context. It would also comply with the Council's Householder SPD which, amongst other things, states that the size, position and form of dormer windows should maintain or improve the character and quality of the existing house and wider area, and that dormer windows to individually designed buildings will be considered on their own merits.

Other Matters

12. I have had regard to the fact that the appeal property is located within the buffer zone of Saltaire World Heritage Site and given consideration to any impact of the proposed dormer window on the setting or significance of this designated heritage asset. Given the modest size and form of the proposed dormer window, I consider that it would not impact on the setting of, or key views into and out of, the World Heritage Site and, therefore, would not harm the significance of this designated heritage asset. As such, the proposed dormer window would not conflict with provisions within the National Planning Policy Framework which seek to protect the significance of designated heritage assets.

Conditions

13. Planning permission is granted subject to the standard three year time limit condition. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. To ensure that the external appearance of the dormer is compatible with its context, a condition is imposed relating to matching materials.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above and subject to conditions, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

F Cullen

INSPECTOR