



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 March 2022

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/22/3293129

23 Granton Street, Laisterdyke, Bradford BD3 8EF

- 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 Paranjit Singh against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/05380/HOU, dated 16 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is front dormer windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The Council's Officer report and reason for refusal do not include any detailed assessment of the impact of the proposed front dormer windows, due to stated discrepancies in the plans that were provided with the planning application. However, their impact on character and appearance is the substantive matter that the Council has identified.
3. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a dwelling which forms part of a continuous row of terraced properties that front onto Granton Street. The roofscape of these dwellings facing the public highway is uninterrupted by the presence of any existing dormer windows.
5. The Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (SPD) sets out that the addition of new dormer windows to the front elevations of individually designed buildings will be considered on their own merits. The SPD sets out further guidance, including on size and positioning and it states that two smaller pitched roof dormer windows are often preferred to one large window, if they can be aligned with the windows below.
6. The appeal proposal is for two larger flat roofed dormer windows which, with the additional clarification provided during the appeal, would appear to meet with some of the guidance of the SPD. This includes their proposed inset into the roof from both the eaves and the ridge, and their distance from the common boundaries of the appeal property. However, each proposed dormer window would have a width of 2.5 metres and would be flat roofed, which

would not accord with the example illustrated in the SPD, where two dormers are proposed.

7. As a result of their widths, the proposed dormers would collectively cover much of the roof, dominating the roof of both the appeal dwelling itself and the continuous roof plane of the terraced dwellings along this side of Granton Street. This impact would be accentuated by the fact that there are no other front dormer windows present in the immediate street scene. The proposal would, due to these factors, cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.
8. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would fail to accord with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2017 (CS), where they seek to protect character and appearance. There would also be a conflict with the overarching aims of the SPD, where it seeks to promote good design. Policy EN3 of the CS refers to the historic environment and is therefore, based on the information I have before me, not relevant to an assessment of the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR