



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 January 2022

by M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/21/3286316
20A Dubb Lane, Bingley BD16 2NW

- 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 Miss G Malik against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/03322/HOU, dated 22 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is front and rear dormer windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The development for which planning permission was sought was described as “retention of front and rear dormers” on both the planning application and appeal forms. I have omitted the words “retention of” in the banner heading above, as they are not descriptive of the development. Nevertheless, the development has been carried out and I was able to see the dormers in place at the time of my site visit.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the dormers on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the wider area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a mid-terrace house, built of stone and with a blue slate roof. Although there are some differences of form and detailing between individual buildings or groups of buildings on Dubb Lane and Olive Terrace to the rear – for example, most of the other properties have Yorkshire Grey stone roofs – in keeping with its neighbours the appeal property is of overwhelmingly traditional appearance. Box dormers, for which the appellant is now seeking planning permission, have been erected on both front and rear roof slopes. These are around 3.5m wide, finished in grey cladding and with grey uPVC window frames.
5. The Council’s 2012 Householder Supplementary Planning Document (“the SPD”) provides guidance on the design of dormer windows and roof extensions. It indicates that for buildings which are not Listed or within Conservation Areas,

such as the appeal property, proposals for dormers on front elevations will be considered on their own merits.

6. I saw on my site visit that, while there are parts of Bingley where front dormers of various styles appear to be reasonably commonplace, there are no other examples on Dubb Lane. Rear dormers are also rare in the immediate surrounding area; the only other example I saw was a large box dormer at the rear of No 18 Dubb Lane, which because of its size and detailing seemed to me to be a bulky and cumbersome addition to that property. The addition of front and rear dormers to the appeal property has therefore already set it at odds with the prevailing traditional character and appearance of its neighbours.
7. The SPD advises that, in order to avoid a dominant appearance, box dormers should be no more than 3m wide. In this case the dormers exceed that measurement and, while they comply with the SPD guidance in respect of being set below the ridge, back from the front wall, and away from the side boundaries, their excessive width makes them relatively bulky additions to the host building. The SPD also states that the materials used for the sides of a dormer should match or be sympathetic to the original roofing material, that wooden or uPVC cladding should be avoided unless these materials are a feature of the original building, and that when cladding is needed it should be restricted to the sides of the dormer window only. While the colour of the dormers in this case is broadly similar to that of the main roof, the use of relatively large areas of cladding on the front in particular results in a visual clash between the dormer and the existing building.
8. The appellant has suggested that the raised height of the eaves on the appeal property means that the front dormer is hidden from public view. I saw on my site visit that, because of the narrow width of the street, the front dormer is indeed not readily visible from immediately outside No 20A. However, it can easily be seen in various other public views close by, including from the footway on the western side of Dubb Lane where it turns towards the appeal site, from the footbridge which crosses the A650 a short way to the east of the appeal site, and from vehicles travelling east on the A650 (or leaving the A650 by the slip road to Ferncliffe Road) north of the appeal site. From all these places, the front dormer is a prominent and disruptive addition to the appeal property. The rear dormer, while less prominent, can clearly be seen in views along Olive Terrace and from the public open space to its east.
9. The appellant has also drawn my attention to the fact that “the main front outlook and street scene is adjacent to a local supermarket” – this is an Aldi on the western side of Dubb Lane. However, while that is a large and modern building which is by no means in keeping with the more traditional housing to its east, it does not provide a convincing justification for allowing additional (and entirely unrelated) harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and its surroundings.
10. The Council’s officer report acknowledges that at least part of the work which has been carried out could potentially be undertaken using permitted development rights. However, my role is to determine the appeal relating to an application for planning permission for the scheme as a whole. For the reasons I have set out above, the development is unsympathetic and intrusive, and as a consequence is harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the wider area. I conclude therefore that the development

conflicts with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the 2017 Bradford Core Strategy, which together seek to ensure that development is well-designed, and responsive to existing positive patterns of development (such as layout, scale and materials) which contribute to the character of the area.

Conclusion

11. The scheme conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations, including those of the Framework, which indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

M Cryan

Inspector