



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: 9 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/22/3296950

36 Broad Lane, Bradford BD4 8PA

- 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 Mohammed Sheikh against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00210/HOU, dated 18 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 14 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as increase of garage roof height. Maximum height to remain as existing, eaves height to increase from 2960mm to 3583mm.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Whilst the name on the application form is simply 'Sheikh', the appeal form has clarified that the appellant's full name is Mr Mohammed Sheikh.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The garage is the eastern part of a larger outbuilding to the rear of No 36 Broad Lane. It is constructed from stone, in part with a render finish, and with both a slate mono-pitched roof and a corrugated metal roof. The outbuilding is separated from the dwelling by a shared access path which serves four stone-built properties in a terraced row. The dwelling is the end terrace and has a traditional slate roof and is rendered on the rear elevation.
5. The proposal would raise the height of the front elevation of the building by 623mm. The rear would only be raised where the existing flat roof exists. The proposal would alter the pitch of the roof which would be changed from a slate roof to a EDPM rubber roof. Timber doors and windows on the front elevation of the building would be changed from wood to uPVC.
6. The garage entrance fronts onto Broadlands Street which runs parallel to the side elevation of No 36. As the building is located at the end of the terrace, it is clearly visible from the adjoining Broad Lane. Raising the height of the front elevation would both retain the overall form of the building, and the stone gable elevation.

7. Whilst there is a variety of roofing materials in the immediate area, including the use of modern tiles on the roofs of housing, and a corrugated metal roof on a building attached to the rear of the garage, traditional materials predominate. Broad Lane has housing both along it and extending into adjoining streets, but it does also have a strong commercial presence with offices and businesses located there. In this context, the retention of traditional buildings and materials make an important contribution to the character of the area, and the need to ensure that appropriate design creates a strong sense of place.
8. The appellant considers that increasing the eaves height of the building would make the roof much less visible. However, the use of a large expanse of a rubber roofing material on a traditional building, would, because of the location of the building, make it visually obtrusive and harm the appearance of the building. The change of the timber doors and windows to uPVC would similarly, with the use of a non-traditional material, effect the character of the outbuilding that currently provides some interest and distinctiveness at the rear of the terraced housing. Although the appellant considers that the site and the surroundings are in a state of disrepair, the garages were in use and did not appear in a dilapidated condition.
9. In relation to the main issue the proposal would have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area. This would not comply with City of Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan (2017) Policy DS1, which seeks to achieve good design and high quality places, and Policy DS3, requiring development proposals to be appropriate to their context in terms of layout, scale, density, details and materials, creating a strong sense of place. The proposal also fails to accord with advice within The Householder Supplementary Planning Document (Local Development Framework for Bradford), April 2012.

Conclusion

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

M J Francis

INSPECTOR