



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2022

by A Caines BSc (Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/21/3281591

11 Pleasant Street, Lidget Green, Bradford BD7 3ES

- 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 Hameed Said against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01576/HOU, dated 8 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is front and rear dormer windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The proposal includes dormer windows to the front and rear, as set out in the development description above. However, it is only the rear dormer to which the Council's reason for refusal is directed. I am satisfied, as evidenced by the content of the Council's delegated officer report and decision notice, that the Council do not find the front dormers to be unacceptable. I shall therefore confine my assessment to the disputed rear dormer.
3. Thus, the main issue is whether the rear dormer window would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Great Horton Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies within the Great Horton Conservation Area (the CA). Some of the important features that contribute to the essential character and significance of the CA are the streets of 19th century terraced housing and a traditional roofscape. The terraced building containing the appeal property is typical of this character, and as such contributes to the importance of the CA as a designated heritage asset.
5. I note that the flat-roofed rear dormer now proposed has been reduced in size from a previously refused application. In addition, at some 3m in width and with separation provided from the eaves, ridge and sides of the roof, the dimensions and positioning of the rear dormer would be compliant with the Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document (2012) (the SPD) in those regards. Even so, I am mindful that the SPD is guidance, not policy, and its strict application will not be appropriate in all circumstances.
6. In this case, it is significant that the terrace has an unaltered roofline. There is also a distinct absence of flat-roof dormers within the immediate surrounding area. Within this context, the bulky and box-like form of the rear dormer would

appear as an unduly dominant and incongruous feature, which would be particularly conspicuous given the absence of other similar dormers on the terrace and in the surrounding area. The contribution made by the appeal site and its traditional roofscape to the significance of the CA would be diminished as a result.

7. I have taken into account that wider public views of the rear roofslope of the terrace are limited. However, the requirement for development proposals to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA applies irrespective of whether or not the proposal is prominent.
8. I therefore conclude that the rear dormer window would have an adverse visual effect on the terraced building and its immediate surroundings, and in turn, would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA as a whole. Whilst the harm to the CA would be classed as less than substantial, there are no public benefits identified which would outweigh that harm. Thus, the proposal conflicts with the design and heritage requirements of Policies DS1, DS3 and EN3 of Bradford's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017). The proposal is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework with regards to achieving well-designed places, as well as conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Other Matters

9. I have noted that the existing chimney is not shown on the drawings. However, I have found harm on other substantive grounds so it has not been necessary to seek further clarification on this matter, as it would not alter the outcome of the appeal.
10. As the Council has not raised any objection to the front dormer windows I have considered the possibility of granting planning permission for only that aspect of the appeal development. However, the various components are inextricably linked to the overall loft conversion scheme, and therefore a split decision permitting the front dormers only would not be appropriate in this case.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons above, I conclude that the proposal would fail to accord with the relevant policies of the development plan and the Framework. Accordingly, the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR