



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2020

by C Dillon BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/20/3252425

5, High Shann Farm, Broadlands, Keighley BD20 6HG

- 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 Ibrar Ahmed against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00657/HOU, dated 18 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as add a second storey to the rear of the property and rear dormer and new roof to all.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The planning application form cites Mr Ahmed as 'applicant', whereas the appeal form cites him as 'agent'. Although subsequent correspondence has clarified that the latter is what was intended, the right of appeal cannot be transferred to another party. The appeal proceeds on that basis.
3. The appellant has advanced a different proposal for this appeal to what was refused planning permission which he considers would overcome the Council's reason for refusal. However, this is materially different to the proposal that was refused planning permission and interested parties have not had an opportunity to comment upon it. Furthermore, it is not the role of the planning appeal process to progress new proposals. So as not to prejudice these parties, this appeal has been determined on the basis of the original submitted scheme which was refused planning permission on 15 April 2020.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider area, with particular regard to scale and design.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a detached stone-built dwelling, located within a small courtyard development which is tucked in behind other houses on the edge of a residential estate. Although this is a relatively recent development, unlike many of its neighbours the host dwelling's character and appearance takes

traditional, rustic design references from Nos 1 and 2 High Shann Farm, including materials, scale and asymmetrical roof design. These are important features which define the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

6. Despite its intimate positioning within the wider estate, the host dwelling and, in particular its gable elevation and asymmetrical roof plane, are the most visible features of the host property between properties on Broadlands and Sandy Gate. Given the rising topography of the estate, the existing roof form of the appeal dwelling is prominent, being read against exposed open sky from these points as it successfully steps up the hill in sequence with its neighbours.
7. The resulting increase in the eaves level of the rear elevation, consequential increase in the ridge height and creation of a symmetrical roof form would significantly change the form of the host building and increase its scale and mass. Visually, the resulting ridge height would become out of step with that of the neighbouring properties when viewed from both Broadlands and Sandy Gate. The proposed dormer extension by virtue of its positioning on the elevated roof plane, width, height, form and excessive amount of cladding would significantly emphasise these changes when viewed in profile and in full. Collectively, these would significantly alter the particular attributes of the dwelling which contribute positively to its existing character and appearance to an extent that would result in an incongruous roof form within the street scene.
8. I observed that other properties in the locality have a symmetrical roof design. However, I also observed that an asymmetrical roof design similar to that of the host property was also a positive local design characteristic within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. Furthermore, although a dormer window was evident at No 3 High Shann Farm, this is a much smaller feature with an apex roof. Further flat roofed dormer windows were observed within the wider area. However, I noted that these were of a much smaller scale which, unlike that which forms part of the appeal proposal, did not unduly dominate their host's roof plane.
9. For these reasons I find that the appeal proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling and wider area, with particular regard to scale and design.
10. The Council's 'Householder Supplementary Planning Document' sets out relevant design guidance. The appeal proposal does not accord with these design principles. This guidance indicates that a dormer of more than 1.5 metres in width may be acceptable on a modern property in some cases. I do not find that exception clause would be applicable in this instance in view of the important character and appearance of the host property which I have identified.
11. Policy DS1 of the 'Local Plan for the Bradford District Core Strategy Development Plan Document' sets out criteria to achieve good design, including proposals being informed by a good understanding of the site/area and its context. Policy DS3 of that plan requires proposals should be appropriate to their context in terms of scale, details and materials amongst things. Existing built features which could contribute to creating a distinctive identity should be retained and integrated and contribute positively to skylines. The appeal proposal conflicts with these policies given the harm which I have identified.

Other Matters

12. Given the juxtaposition between the existing roof lights relative to the heights and positions of neighbouring properties, I do not agree that the proposal would improve privacy levels for occupants of the appeal property.
13. I am sympathetic to the appellant's argument that there is a requirement to adjust the living accommodation to better serve the needs of the occupants of No 5. I note, with the exception of the cladding for the proposed dormer, that the materials proposed would be appropriate to the character and appearance of the dwelling. However, these considerations are insufficient to outweigh the conflict with Policy DS1 and DS3 that I have identified.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should be dismissed.

C Dillon

INSPECTOR