



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2024 by L Clark MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/24/3348640

10 Nab Wood Rise, Shipley, West Yorkshire BD18 4JA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs N Rahman against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00527/HOU.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Retrospective consent for front and rear dormers, two-storey side extension and rear extension'
-

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 Matter and Main Issue

3. The reason for refusal refers to the two-storey side extension and the front dormer implying that the Council do not object to the scheme's other elements. I have no reason to disagree. My recommendation therefore focusses on the same, and specifically its effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal building is a hip roofed, two storey semi-detached dwelling on a residential cul de sac where the land levels slope noticeably uphill towards the end. It shares noticeable similarities with its counterparts, on a street where there is consistency to general siting, form and street scene presentation. Particularly in the roof scape which is largely unaltered. Some buildings have been extended, including to the rear and side. These are, in the main, subservient and conventional, respecting building heights and shapes. This general sense of uniformity contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The dormer to the front of the building stands out as an alien feature in disrupting the even rhythm of the street scene's roof scape. Its visual effect is exacerbated by both the position of the dwelling on high ground, the amount of roof it subsumes and its large, bulky, flat roofed design. The two storey side extension, whilst largely unobtrusive and similar to other examples in general form and land take terms, is stepped in from the front which creates a

contrived and unrelated angle to its roof shape. Due then to the use of a forward projecting roof over the larger ground floor, a much smaller first floor window has been inserted which appears squat and unrelated to the fenestration on the host dwelling. These factors combine to detrimentally affect the quality of the street scene's consistency and adversely affect the character and appearance of the area.

6. As such, the development causes harm to the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2017. These are concerned with development being informed by its context amongst other things.

Other Matters

7. The appellants have suggested amendments to the finish of the dormer, but this would not make up for the harm caused by its size and location. I am also aware of what appears to be an extant planning permission for one on the front. The approved plans however show something much shallower than what is being applied for to effectively retain here. This fallback position does not therefore change my findings.
8. The appeal site is located within 1km of the Saltaire World Heritage Site. However, given the location and nature of the development, along with its immediate context, it would unlikely give rise to any harm to the significance thereof. This is the same conclusion that the Council came to on this matter.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. There are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate a decision other than in accordance with the development plan with which the appeal scheme conflicts for the reasons I have set out. I therefore recommend the appeal be dismissed.

L Clark

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR