



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2025

by **E Heron MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/25/3358584

41 Briggs Avenue, BRADFORD, West Yorkshire, BD6 3AS

- 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 H Parveen & Hussain against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/03304/HOU.
 - The development proposed is construction of two storey side rear, porch. Front & rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Although 'Retrospective' is included in the description of development in the application form and the decision notice, I have not included it in my heading as it is not a description of development. The application form confirms the development has been completed, and I was able to see this during my site visit. I have determined the appeal on that basis.
3. The proposed plan states, "Rear dormer built under permitted development rights," which I understand to be a reference to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (GPDO), as amended. However, it is not for me, under this appeal, to determine whether elements of the proposal would comply with the GPDO or are lawful. It is open to the appellants to apply to the Council for a separate determination under Sections 191/192 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, regardless of the outcome of the appeal. I have therefore considered the development as described in its entirety.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is within a residential area of two-storey, mainly terraced, dwellings, all of a similar appearance and set back from the road. There is uniformity in the street scene, in the building lines, and roof slopes, and a horizontal emphasis by way of the long run of lean-to projections, and window detailing. Dormers punctuate the roof line at intervals along Briggs Avenue and other nearby streets, and these are generally of a scale that does not dominate the roof slope. The back of Briggs Avenue also forms part of the street scene, as there

is a gap at the corner with Auckland Road, which allow views towards the rear elevations. Here again, there is uniformity in the building line and roof slopes, mixed with the informality of the rear boundary treatments and rear extensions.

6. The appeal property sits at the end of the terrace at the junction with Auckland Road and, its front, side and rear elevation are highly prominent in the street scene. It contributes to the area through its cohesion with the terrace row, and relationship with adjoining streets.
7. The two storey side extension sits comfortably within the context of Briggs Avenue, due to the general adherence to the uniform elements of the street. Albeit the dwelling's larger size in comparison to the rest of the terrace is apparent, due to the render finish and porch position.
8. The scale, massing and positioning of the front dormer appears subservient within the context of the larger dwelling and is proportionate with other dormers within its context. The cladding to the front face is modest, and the whole structure blends well with the dark colour of the tile-hung dormer cheeks, the colour of the windows and the roof. It has a recessive appearance, and for this reason it broadly adheres to the guidance in the Local Development Framework for Bradford, Householder Supplementary Planning Document.
9. Turning to the rear elevation, the extension has altered the massing of the dwelling, such that it no longer adheres to the simple uniform appearance of the terrace row. However, the symmetry of the stone and render wrapping around the building, and the continuity with the main terrace roof line, assist in grounding the extension to some degree. The gable feature and the overall projection of the extension, whilst not in keeping with the street scene uniformity, marks the end of the terrace and shares characteristics with the massing of the extension at the junction between Auckland Road and Moore Avenue nearby.
10. Nevertheless, the rear dormer window is a large, bulky, and highly prominent structure that sits awkwardly next to the gabled roof projection, and flat roof, resulting in a confusion of upper storey elements. As such it disrupts the terrace row's roof line. Its small windows positioned in the upper portion of its front face, together with the excessive amount of cladding visible underneath, are at odds with the fenestration and proportions of the rest of the rear elevation. Hence, its visual appearance harmfully jars with the host dwelling, other visible dormers in the locality, and the character and appearance of the area.
11. Overall, I conclude that the proposal harms the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. As such, the development conflicts with policies DS1 and DS3 of the Local Plan for the Bradford District, Core Strategy Development Plan Document, (adopted July 2017), that seek to achieve good design and high quality places by responding to and complementing the local context.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

E Heron

INSPECTOR