



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2023

**by A Caines BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 26 June 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/23/3316530**

**122 Fagley Road, Bradford BD2 3JJ**

- 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 M Sultan against the decision of: City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
  - The application Ref 22/04230/HOU, dated 29 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 November 2022.
  - The development proposed is described as 'construction of dormer window to front (hip roof to gable permitted development)'.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and street scene.

## Reasons

3. Fagley Road is characterised by semi-detached and terraced houses of traditional style and materials. The appeal property is part of a group of semi-detached dwellings featuring distinctive dual pitched gables at the front. The gables are an important architectural component of the dwellings and add positively to their unity as a group.
4. The proposal includes a hip-to-gable roof alteration at the side and a front dormer window. The hip-to-gable alteration would mirror that already carried out to No 120, thereby restoring some balance to this semi-detached pair. Nonetheless, the removal of the front gable and erection of a large, prominent, flat-roof dormer on just one of the dwellings would severely disrupt the architectural composition and symmetry of the front elevations. This would significantly harm the character and appearance of the dwellings as a semi-detached pair, despite the benefit of the hip-to-gable alteration.
5. While there is a very similar example at No 177, I am advised that it significantly pre-dates the current development plan and guidance against which I must assess this appeal. It does not therefore set any precedent for similar development. If anything, it only serves to demonstrate the harm that would be caused by the proposal.
6. I have also taken into account that dormers are not an uncommon feature in the street scene. However, the semi-detached houses with dormers are a different house type and the dormers come as a pair. They also tend to be

smaller in scale and mostly with a pitched roof design that respects the traditional character of the buildings on which they sit. Other flat roof examples are not positive features and should not be replicated.

7. The appellant emphasises that the dormer has been designed to comply with the Council's Householder Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Even so, I am mindful that the SPD is guidance, not policy, and its strict application will not be appropriate in all circumstances.
8. Overall, I find that the proposal would not be a well-designed and sympathetic addition to the host building and street scene. As such, there is conflict with Policies DS1 and DS3 of Bradford's Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017), which among other things, require that development is well designed and should make a positive contribution to the streetscape and the character of the area in which it is situated.

### **Other Matters**

9. Any benefits the proposal may bring in terms of improved internal living accommodation would not justify or outweigh the harm that would be caused and the resultant conflict that arises with the development plan as a whole.

### **Conclusion**

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

*A Caines*

INSPECTOR