



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 January 2022

by M Clowes BA (Hons) MCD PGCERT (Arch con) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/21/3287429

12 Lodore Avenue, Bradford BD2 4JG

- 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 A Ali against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/03482/HOU, dated 15 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as construction of dormer window to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. There have been a number of previous applications relating to the erection of dormer windows at this site. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal based on the submitted plans.
3. I have taken the appellant's name from the appeal and personal details forms, as a typing error appears to have occurred on the planning application form. I have determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site consists of a detached dormer bungalow constructed of artificial stone and pantile, situated in a residential area. There is a symmetry to the dwelling currently, with the dormers flanking the front porch. Lodore Avenue is divided with 2 storey houses on one side of the road and bungalows along the other. Some of the house types have been extended and altered and materials are mixed including render, brick and stone, leading to some minor variation within the street scene. Whilst dormer windows to front roofslopes are not widespread, there are a small number of both box and pitched roof dormers within Lodore Avenue.
6. It is proposed to erect a flat roofed 'box' dormer window to the front roofslope of the dwelling, alongside 2 existing larger versions. There is a further single, sizeable box dormer to the rear.

7. My attention has been drawn to the Householder Supplementary Planning Document (SPD, 2012) which sets out detailed guidance on extensions to dwellings. Part 6 of Section 3 of the SPD, states that the addition of new dormer windows to individually designed buildings will be considered on their own merits. It sets out general design principles in relation to size, position, form and materials. The SPD further advises that where there are existing dormers within the street, new dormer windows should be of the same size, position within the roof, and detailing, to minimise the visual disruption to the roofscapes of the dwellings.
8. The appellant has suggested that there are many dwellings with up to 3 dormer windows to front elevations. I saw that existing bungalows at 16, 26 and 28 Lodore Avenue contain 2 dormer windows to the front roofslope, as is the case at the appeal site. The introduction of a third dormer window to the front, would result in an overly cluttered roofslope. This would contrast with the plain roofscapes of the majority of dwellings within the street scene.
9. The appellant states that the proposed dormer window would be below the 1.5m width set out in the SPD. However, this standard applies to pitched roof rather than box dormer windows. It is acknowledged that the proposed dormer window would be smaller in width than the existing front dormers and it would also be set in from the outside wall, above the eaves and down from the ridge of the roof. Nevertheless, these measures would not sufficiently reduce the dominance of the proposed dormer window, which would be viewed in conjunction with the existing dormers. Together, the dormers would take up most of the front roof space and be dominant as a result. Furthermore, due to the difference in size of the proposed dormer window to those existing, it would disrupt the symmetry of the dwelling. It would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the dwelling and wider area as a result.
10. The proposed materials would match those on the existing dormers and accord with the existing roof in terms of colour. As such, they would be sympathetic. However, this would not overcome the harm identified in respect of the position of the proposed dormer window.
11. I conclude that the proposed dormer window would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would conflict with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the City of Bradford Metropolitan Borough Council Core Strategy, Development Plan Document (2017). These policies, amongst other things, seek to ensure new development is of good design and appropriate to the context of existing buildings and surroundings, including layout, scale and details. It would also conflict with guidance within the SPD as outlined above.

Conclusion

12. As a whole, there are no considerations that would warrant taking a decision otherwise than in accordance with the Development Plan. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Clowes

INSPECTOR