



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2020

by William Cooper BA (Hons) MA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/19/3240791

2 Midgeley Road, Baildon BD17 7LR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Katie Cooke against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref: 19/02762/HOU, dated 28 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for rear dormer at 2 Midgeley Road, Baildon BD17 7LR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: 19/02762/HOU, dated 28 June 2019, and the plans submitted with it.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the rear dormer on the character and appearance of the area, including the host dwelling.

Reasons

3. The site is a semi-detached dwelling in a residential area. The dwelling is not a listed building, nor within a conservation area. A dormer similar in appearance to the proposal before me has been constructed on the rear roof slope.
4. The area is characterised by a mixture of semi-detached and terraced properties of twentieth century, municipal style. Within this context, the host dwelling reads 'on the ground' as a somewhat individual property, given the following combination of factors: its corner location facing onto a larger triangular grass verge; its oblique orientation in relation to other properties within its block; its modernised render finish; and gable roof conversion.
5. There is a general absence of rear dormers within the host block of properties, and the dormer is substantial, extending across around half the total roof width. Nevertheless, I saw during my site visit that the following factors together help the dormer to assimilate visually into its location: the dark grey colour of the dormer's banded cladding approximately blends with the colour of the surrounding concrete roof tiles; the host property's somewhat individual character and appearance enables a somewhat 'bespoke' approach on this plot; the dormer's location at the rear of the host building; the inset between the main roof ridge height and the top of the dormer; and the somewhat oblique

relationships between neighbouring properties, which together with the short depth of the site's rear yard, limit views of the dormer from the host and surrounding properties.

6. The dormer does not accord with the following design principles set out in the guidance in section 3.6 of the Bradford Householder Supplementary Planning Document (SPD): it exceeds 3m in width; and its walls are clad in composite cladding rather than the concrete tile of the main roof. Nevertheless, in using a dark grey colour exterior material for the bulk of the dormer, which broadly matches the colour of the roof tiles, the dormer goes some way to satisfy Design Principle 6 of the SPD. Moreover, on balance, I consider that, due to the assimilating factors described above, the dormer avoids damaging the character and appearance of the neighbourhood, and thereby meets one of the SPD's objectives.
7. I appreciate the Council's wish to achieve harmonious design. Nevertheless, for the reasons described above, I find that, in this case, the fresh architectural energy of the appeal property is able to co-exist acceptably, in terms of character and appearance, without overly dominating the host dwelling or the 'metro' style architecture which 'holds its own' around it.
8. To conclude, the proposed development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, including that of the host dwelling. As such, it is not in conflict with Policies DS1, DS3 and SC9 of the Bradford District Core Strategy (2017), which, together seek to ensure that development complements local character.

Conditions

9. The Council has put forward suggested conditions, including a three year period for commencement of development, for the development to take place in accordance with the approved plans, and for the dormer to be clad in roof tiles. However, having regard to the advice on conditions in the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), and to the construction which has already taken place, I consider that none are required in this case.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

William Cooper

INSPECTOR