
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2021

by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/21/3273687

32 Oakfield Grove, Bradford BD9 4PY

- 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 Nisar Ahmed against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00519/HOU, dated 31 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 29 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Retrospective application for dormers'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my site visit the development was already in place. I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.
3. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in July 2021. This has replaced the 2019 iteration. Whilst there have been some changes to content and thus paragraph numbers, the substance of the Framework as it relates to the main issues of the case have not changed. I have not therefore sought the views of the main parties since, for these reasons, their respective cases would not be prejudiced. I have proceeded on this basis.

Main Issue

4. Whether the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the North Park Road Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

5. The significance of the CA is partly derived from the dense layout and rows of terraced properties which have a historic association with the nearby mill. The appeal property is a two storey mid-terraced dwelling of similar appearance to the adjacent properties along Oakfield Grove. It therefore reflects the characteristics of the wider CA and makes a positive contribution to it.
6. The existing dormers on the front roof slope of the appeal property are set just below the ridge line and have a limited set back from the front elevation. As such, they are of a considerable height, have prominent side cheeks and collectively cover a substantial proportion of the host roof. They therefore read as overly dominant and top-heavy additions to the host property rather than subservient features.

7. Due to their size and siting, the dormers are highly prominent from the public realm and appear at odds with and interrupt the roofscape in the street scene. Although there are several examples of roof alterations to properties along Oakfield Grove, including front dormers, unlike the appeal development most examples are subservient additions that ensure the continuous roofline of the terrace remains the prominent and dominant feature. The proposed replacement of the cladding on the appeal dormers with slate to match the host roof would not overcome these concerns sufficiently to make the development acceptable.
8. Given the scale of the development in context, the harm it causes would be less than substantial. In accordance with the Framework, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits. I have not been made aware of any such benefits. The Framework is clear that irrespective of the level of harm, great weight should be given to the conservation of a heritage asset. The CA in this case.
9. Accordingly, and with the above in mind, the development neither preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the CA. It therefore conflicts with Policies DS1, DS3 and EN3 of the Local Plan for the Bradford District, Core Strategy Development Plan Document, the Householder Supplementary Planning Document (April 2012) and the Framework. These policies and guidance collectively seek, amongst other things, to ensure that developments are informed by and respond to the site and its wider context and conserve heritage assets.

Other Matter

10. Whilst I observed examples of front dormers in nearby streets, I do not know the full circumstances under which they have been constructed. In any event, this appeal has been determined on its own merits and the examples do not serve to justify the appeal development as a result.

Conclusion

11. The development conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations, including the Framework, that outweigh this conflict. Therefore, and for the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

H Ellison
INSPECTOR