



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 January 2024 by A Khan BSc (Hons) MA

Decision by S Edwards BA MA MATCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/23/3332074

1-2 Ashfield Terrace, Wyke, Bradford BD12 9HB

- 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 Andrew Hinchcliffe against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/02049/HOU.
 - The development proposed is dormer window and single storey porch to front and sliding door to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) on 19 December 2023. Whilst I have had regard to the revised national policy as a material consideration, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance, the issues most relevant to the appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.
4. The description of development as detailed on the application form has been amended in subsequent documents. I have used the description included on the Decision Notice, which describes the proposal accurately and concisely.
5. No concerns were raised by the Council regarding the proposed front porch and sliding rear door; therefore, my recommendation will solely focus on the effect of the proposed dormer.

Main Issue

6. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

7. The appeal site is in a residential area with predominantly terraced dwellings, some of which include roof alterations. The appeal site comprises original back-to-back stone terraced dwellings which have been combined to form a singular dwellinghouse. As a result, the front and rear elevations both face Ashfield Terrace.
8. The proposed dormer window would be located at the front and would be significantly wider than the approved front dormer at 4 Ashfield Terrace. Due to its excessive width and excessive scale, the proposed dormer would dominate the roof space and fail to remain subservient to the host property. It would negatively alter the roofscape, resulting in a form of development which would be incongruous to the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area. Although the proposed materials would seek to match the existing colour of the roof and windows, this would not mitigate the harm which would be caused by the excessive width and scale of the dormer.
9. I have had regard to other dormer windows which have been constructed in proximity to the appeal site. In the absence of further evidence, I do not know the circumstances of these particular examples and cannot therefore be certain that they represent a direct parallel to the appeal proposal, and whether they benefit from planning permission. Consequently, I have ascribed very limited weight to these developments.
10. Although the dormer would provide additional residential space for the appellant's family, this would not outweigh the identified harm. The proposed dormer window would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and area. Consequently, it would be contrary to Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document (Adopted July 2017). These policies require a design-led approach which ensures that proposals are informed by the site context, integrate with their surroundings to create a distinctive identity and contribute positively to the roofscape skyline. The proposal would also be contrary to the Bradford Householder Supplementary Planning Document, which seeks to ensure that any roof extensions or alterations are carefully considered.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. There are no material considerations, which indicate that the appeal should be determined, other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Khan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR