



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 July 2022

by M J Francis BA (Hons) MA MSc MCIfA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/22/3297728

36 Park Crescent, Bradford BD3 0JZ

- 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 Nazakat Khan against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00420/HOU, dated 1 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 24 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as retrospective application for a rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant has stated that the dormer was constructed using permitted development rights, but they had been informed by the Council that the composite cladding did not comply. It is agreed by all parties that the proposal does not comply with "the Order", and so planning permission has been applied for.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. No 36 Park Crescent is a cream painted, stone built, mid-terraced house within an area of traditional terraced and semi-detached housing. To the rear of the house is a back lane which is located at the bottom of Wightman Street.
5. The rear dormer extension has been constructed some distance below the ridgeline of the roof, just inset from the eaves, and adjacent to the apex of a mono-pitched two storey extension to the rear. The dormer has two brown coloured windows, with brown timber panels on both the sides and front of the extension.
6. The location of no 36, and the position of the dormer on the rear, means that the proposal is visible along the lane to the rear of Park Crescent and from Wightman Street, which slopes down towards the site. The position and size of the dormer makes it appear top heavy and oversized for the roofscape. This is because the use of brown coloured panels increases the visibility of the dormer within the surrounding area. The extent of the panelling and the contrast between the colour and the slate roof, highlights the unsuitability of the

material, which in turn exacerbates the size and position of the dormer. The dormer therefore appears as an incongruous feature on the roof which has a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area.

7. I noted other rear dormer extensions along the terrace, and in the immediate area, when visiting the site. These were smaller in scale, mainly white in colour, and a number had slate coloured side panels. This meant that they were less obtrusive than the appeal site. I have, however, no information before me on the planning history of these dormers and the appeal has been determined on its own merits.
8. In relation to the main issue, the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore fail to accord with City of Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan, 2017, Policy DS1: Achieving Good Design, which seeks to achieve good design and high quality places, and Policy DS3: Urban Character, where development proposals should be appropriate to their context in terms of layout, scale, density, details and materials. The proposal also fails to accord with the advice on dormers within The Householder Supplementary Planning Document, 2012.

Conclusion

9. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

M J Francis

INSPECTOR