



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2023

by M Ollerenshaw BSc (Hons) MTPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/23/3319219

33 Windermere Road, Bradford BD7 4RH

- 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 Mrs N Kauser against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/05336/HOU, dated 21 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with front and rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for loft conversion with front and rear dormers at 33 Windermere Road, Bradford BD7 4RH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/05336/HOU, dated 21 December 2022, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan: PDA21-073-002 Rev A.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the decision above I have used the description set out on the decision notice as this includes reference to the rear dormer and is more precise than that given on the planning application form.
3. The development proposed has already been carried out. I have therefore dealt with the appeal scheme as seeking retrospective planning permission.
4. The Council has only raised objections with regard to the front dormer. I agree with this approach and I have, therefore, limited my assessment to the planning merits, or otherwise, of this element alone.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a two storey mid terraced dwelling of stone construction with a pitched slate roof. It is set back from the road with a small front garden. Windermere Road consists mainly of semi-detached and terraced two storey dwellings which are generally arranged in a linear fashion with consistent building lines and a strong street scene presence, which contributes positively to the character of the area.

7. The proposed front dormer as built is slightly wider than 3m and in this respect does not accord with the Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD), which states that to avoid appearing over dominant, box style dormer windows should be a maximum of 3m wide. However, the dormer maintains 1m gaps from both sides of the roof and it is set back from the eaves and slightly below the ridge. Accordingly, the dormer is reasonably proportioned, it sits comfortably on the roof and does not appear as an overly dominant addition to the property.
8. Whilst the front dormer includes some cladding to its face, it is a small amount and is a good match to the slate roof of the property. It is not significantly harmful to either the character of the property or the street scene. Furthermore, there are examples of other front dormers in the wider area which include elements of front cladding. The proposal does not have a markedly different impact to the scheme previously approved by the Council¹.
9. The SPD is presented as guidance only and it sets out that the application of the guidance will not be appropriate in all circumstances. With this in mind, and for the above reasons, whilst there is a conflict with the SPD I do not consider that the proposal causes harm to the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area. As such, it complies with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Local Plan for Bradford District: Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2017. Amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that development achieves good design and contributes to the area's character.

Conditions

10. The Council suggests materials conditions but these are not necessary as the development has been constructed. I have however, for clarity and enforceability, set out the approved plans.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, and subject to the condition specified, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

M Ollerenshaw

INSPECTOR

¹ Council ref. 21/02428/HOU