



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 November 2024 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/24/3351735

18 Nursery Road, Bradford, West Yorkshire BD7 4LH

- 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 Safeel Javed against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01852/HOU.
 - The development proposed is dormers as built.
-

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 description of development on the planning application form is 'retrospective application for dormers as built'. However, I have removed the words 'retrospective application for' in the banner heading as they are not a description of development.
4. The proposed drawings include dormer windows to the front and rear roof slopes of the host dwelling. The reason for refusal on the Council's decision notice specifically identifies concerns in respect of the 'front dormer windows'. The drawings include 'As built Elevation D (Front)' and it is clear from the evidence before me that this is the elevation that the Council is referring to. I have therefore defined the main issue on that basis.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the 'front dormer windows' on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. 18 Nursery Road (No 18) is a detached dwelling situated in an elevated position at the top of Nursery Road. Nursery Road is primarily characterised by two-storey terraced dwellings and semi-detached bungalows. Most of the two-storey dwellings have plain pitched roofs with dark coloured roof tiles. Some of the bungalows have flat roof dormer windows with white cladding, but

these are of modest slimline proportions. The general consistency of roof forms on Nursery Road positively contributes to an orderly and cohesive street scene.

7. Even accounting for the inset position of the front dormers from the sides of the roof slope, their bulky flat-roofed form which extends very close to the ridgeline, the proliferation of their large windows and the white cladding incorporated, all combines to form an unsympathetic and dominant feature within the bungalow's roof. They appear conspicuous compared to the streamlined dormer windows on other bungalows in the street. Given their considerable scale and elevated position, darker coloured cladding or roof tiles would not be sufficient to assimilate the front dormer windows within the roof and the immediate surroundings.
8. I conclude, the front dormer windows are harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. In that regard, the development conflicts with Policies DS1 (Achieving Good Design) and DS3 (Urban Character) of the City of Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2017), which together require that development proposals are informed by a good understanding of the site/area and appropriate to their context in terms of layout, scale, density, details and materials.

Other Matter

9. I have had regard to the support received from a neighbouring occupier. Even if the development does not result in overlooking or a loss of light to neighbouring properties, this does not justify the harm identified to the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed as the development conflicts with the development plan.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

M Russell

INSPECTOR