
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 June 2020

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/20/3245246

36 High Street, Steeton With Eastburn BD20 6NT

- 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 Jonathan Morris against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/04304/HOU, dated 14 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as dormer windows to front and rear elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area including the Steeton Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appellant's statement confirms that existing dormer windows, to the front and rear of the property, do not benefit from planning permission and that consent has been sought both by planning application and subsequently at appeal. The appeal scheme seeks consent for single large dormer windows to the front and rear of the appeal property that are of a reduced size and scale from that currently constructed at the site.
4. At the site visit I saw that the appeal site occupies a prominent position to the top of a steeply sloping street and that the existing large dormer windows are a prominent and incongruous feature that harm the character and appearance of the area.
5. The Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (SPD) sets out guidance for, amongst other matters, the construction of dormer windows including within a CA. Guidance within the SPD relevant to the appeal scheme includes that materials are to match or be sympathetic to the original roofing materials and "normally be restricted to the sides of the dormer window, and not to the front elevation."
6. Turning to the design of dormer windows within a CA, the SPD states that pitched roof dormers, up to a maximum width of 1.5m will normally be allowed to the front elevations of properties. To the rear elevation, the SPD states that where the secondary elevation is clearly visible from an important vantage

point the guidance for front elevations applies and in other instances “well designed windows that accord with all the relevant design principles will normally be acceptable”

7. The application form details “dormer walls to be clad in natural blue slate to match existing roof”. The submitted plans show cladding to the side elevations and, though reduced as a result of the large windows, to the front elevation. The proposed dormer window to the rear elevation includes a greater element of cladding. Though I note that the rear dormer would be visible from public spaces including roads and green space, I did not observe that the rear dormer would be visible from any important vantage points.
8. The proposed large flat roofed dormer windows are shown on the submitted plans as being set in from the side boundaries of the property, up from the eaves and, the appellant states, are less than 3 metres in width. Nonetheless being in a CA, the Council’s SPD seeks pitched roof dormer windows up to a maximum of 1.5 metres wide.
9. The substantial box dormer windows proposed by the appeal scheme therefore, while much reduced in size from the previous scheme, do not comply with the guidance set out in the SPD for dormer windows within CA.
10. The appellant states that 3 of the 8 dwellings on this terrace have existing dormer windows. However, I saw at the site visit that the presence of dormer windows is not a characteristic of this part of the CA and those dormer windows that I saw at the site visit do not convince me as to the acceptability of the appeal scheme.
11. Consequently, I find that the proposed dormer windows would harm the overall character and appearance of the area including the CA, which generally consists of well-proportioned and traditional stone built properties. This harm would be ‘less than substantial’ as directed by the Planning Practice Guidance, but I attach considerable importance and weight to the statutory duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 that special attention should be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
12. On the basis of the evidence before me, I find that the dormer windows, while an improvement on the existing design, nonetheless harm the character and appearance of the area and they fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA. As such, the development is in conflict with policies EN3, DS1, DS3, and SC9 of the adopted Local Plan for the Bradford District Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the guidance contained within the SPD, which seek to promote high quality design that is appropriate to its context.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mark Brooker

INSPECTOR