



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 November 2019

by D Child BA BPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/19/3236973

1a Marshfield Street, Bradford BD5 9NB

- 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 M Rahfan against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02299/HOU, dated 29 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of dormer cladding to front and rear dormers to match existing roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the replacement of dormer cladding to front and rear dormers to match existing roof, at 1a Marshfield Street, Bradford BD5 9NB, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/02299/HOU, dated 29 May 2019, and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matters and Main Issue

2. The cladding on both dormers had already been replaced at the time of my visit. I shall proceed to consider the appeal on this basis.
3. There is no dispute between the main parties that the alteration of the rear dormer does not require planning permission, and I see no reason to disagree. The Council's reason for refusal relates solely to the front dormer. The main issue is therefore the effect of the replacement cladding to the front dormer on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Marshfield Street is lined by two-storey, stone-built terraced dwellings, a significant number of which exhibit dormer window additions on front roof slopes. These additions vary in width, and in the finish and extent of their cladding. Although cladding varies, a significant number are clad in a natural or artificial slate to match the existing roofs. This gives the area its easily identifiable character and a strong sense of place. In this context the cladding to the front dormer does not appear out of keeping.
5. Front dormers either side of the appeal dwelling are narrower. They do not have a significant amount of cladding beneath their glazing, and the width of the front appeal dormer marginally exceeds the Council's guidance¹.

¹ Local Development Framework for Bradford Householder Supplementary Planning Document 2012

6. Nevertheless, the proposal is for re-cladding of existing dormers. The finish and extent of cladding to the front dormer is not inconsistent with other examples on the street. In the overall street scene, the appeal scheme is for relatively minor alterations, and matches the existing roof finish. The impact of the development on the visual amenity of the area is not therefore significant.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the replacement cladding to the front dormer does not cause undue harm to the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, the appeal development does not conflict with the design and place making aims of Policies DS1, DS3 or SC9 of the Local Plan for the Bradford District, Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2017.

Conclusion

8. The appeal should succeed, and planning permission should be granted.

D Child

INSPECTOR