



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 10 November 2020

by Jillian Rann BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/20/3259106

9 Armidale Way, Bradford, West Yorkshire BD2 1EN

- 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 Mrs Shabana Kausar against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/02498/HOU, dated 24 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 25 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is alteration to roof and rear dormer to accommodate w/c and infant's bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alteration to roof and rear dormer to accommodate w/c and infant's bedroom at 9 Armidale Way, Bradford, West Yorkshire BD2 1EN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 20/02498/HOU, dated 24 June 2020, 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 plan: Prop Floor Plans and Elevs Drawing No 20-029-02.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external faces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The cheeks and the non-glazed sections of the face of the rear dormer hereby permitted shall be clad using vertically hung tiles or slates of a similar colour and finish to those used on the rear roof slope of the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and its surroundings.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a semi-detached bungalow which has been extended to the side and has an existing flat-roofed dormer to the rear. The site is in an estate of houses and bungalows of similar age and appearance. Numerous other bungalows on the same side of Armidale Way as the site and on

surrounding streets also have large rear dormers which can be glimpsed from the road frontages within the estate.

4. It is proposed to raise the roof height of the existing side extension and extend the existing rear dormer over the enlarged roof. The extended dormer would be wider and closer to the edge of the extended roof than is recommended in the Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD). However, it would still be set in from the sides of the roof and positioned below its ridge and above the eaves.
5. The existing rear dormer is already of some significant width and height, and occupies most of the bungalow's original rear roof slope. In that context, the additional width and massing of the extended rear dormer would be relatively limited. Furthermore, as the rear of the existing dormer is finished in white cladding, it stands out prominently against the rear roof slope. In contrast, the face and cheeks of the extended dormer would be hung with tiles to match the bungalow's existing roof, thus minimising its presence and prominence to some degree. Taking those factors together, the extended dormer would not appear significantly more dominant in relation to the extended property than the existing dormer does in relation to the roof of the original property at present.
6. From Armidale Way only a small proportion of the dormer's side elevation would be visible, as part of the existing rear dormer is currently, and the additional width of the extended rear dormer would not be perceptible. Therefore, the extended dormer would not appear unduly dominant or have a materially greater effect on public views from Armidale Way compared to the existing dormer.
7. Glimpses of the extended rear dormer may be possible between buildings from streets to the side and rear. However, because of the layout of those surrounding streets and the relatively narrow gaps between their buildings, such glimpses are likely to be fleeting and limited, and the dormer would be likely to be seen in the context of other rear dormers on Armidale Way. The intention to hang the face and cheeks of the extended dormer with materials to match the bungalow's roof would further minimise its presence and prominence in those limited public views of the site and could be secured via condition.
8. Overall, taking into account the proposed materials, those very limited public views and the presence of other large rear dormers visible in nearby streets, the extended dormer proposed in this case would not appear incongruous or unduly prominent in its context. Therefore, it would not have an adverse effect on the character or appearance of the site or its surroundings.
9. Increasing the roof height of the existing side extension would bring its pitch more in line with that of the original building's roof. Because of the extension's limited scale, the increase in its roof height would not unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties. Accordingly, that aspect of the proposed development is also acceptable.
10. Therefore, despite some technical conflict with the guidance in the SPD, I conclude that the proposed development would not have an adverse effect on the character or appearance of the appeal site or its surroundings in this case. It would therefore not conflict with Policy DS1 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document which requires development proposals to contribute to achieving good design and high quality places.

Conditions

11. I attach a condition specifying the approved plans, for certainty. Conditions requiring the use of matching materials to the enlarged extension, and to the face and cheeks of the dormer, are necessary to protect the character and appearance of the site and its surroundings.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Jillian Rann
INSPECTOR