



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2025

by F P Tinsley MA (Hons) MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/25/3358429

31 Fairfax Road, Bingley, Bradford BD16 4DR

- 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 Fairfax Yorkshire Ltd against the decision of the City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application reference is Ref: 24/04006/FUL
 - The development proposed is described as 'Amalgamation of 31/31a Fairfax Road to create one residential dwelling with addition of dormer window to front elevation'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs has been made by the appellant against the Council in respect of the appeal. This application is the subject of a separate decision notice.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. Fairfax Road is a pleasant and spacious residential street featuring a variety of housing types and architectural designs. The dwellings are generally two storeys in height, with some exceptions. All properties are set back from the public footpath within their individual plots. A mix of materials is used, including brick and render, while tiles of varying colours and sizes form the primary roofing material.
5. The eastern side of the street is noticeably higher than the western side due to the sloping hillside location, resulting in buildings on the eastern side appearing more prominent. Mature vegetation is present in various locations, helping to soften the streetscape in a positive manner.
6. The appeal site is unusual on the street, as it currently consists of two flats located above garages at ground-floor level. It appears that the hillside has been excavated to accommodate this configuration. While this means that, compared to other buildings on the street, the overall height of the building is similar, its front elevation presents as a three-storey structure with an additional roof level. It is a significant and prominent building which is unusual compared to the predominant

two storey form elsewhere and together with the adjacent No. 33 to which it is attached, presents as a significant block of development, incorporating extensive areas of glazing on the front elevation. However, it does present as a building with symmetry, balance and coherence in design.

7. A significant proportion of the proposed dormer would be clad in zinc giving it a heavy and bulky appearance. Moreover, the use of zinc would stand out against both the existing concrete roofing tiles and utilitarian brickwork creating further visual disharmony. When viewed from the street, the dormer's discordance would be accentuated by its notable height on the roof of a prominent building. Also, its position to one side of the building would unbalance the appearance of the host building's symmetrical roof. The proposed dormer would therefore appear as an incongruous addition on the host dwelling and in the street. I am not convinced that the use of materials to clad the dormer which are more in keeping with the existing elevational treatment of the building, as suggested by the appellant, would adequately address the fundamental concerns I have regarding balance and bulk.
8. The appellant draws my attention to the fact that a similar design approach is used elsewhere in Bradford, with an example cited in Figure 4 of the Supplementary Design Information submitted to the Council as part of the application in December 2024. This example comes from Hope Terrace in Edinburgh. However, it clearly relates to a building with a distinct and well-defined architectural style, where dormers similar to that subject to this appeal, successfully differentiate themselves from the rest of the structure in design terms. This contrast serves to accentuate and highlight the building's striking stone construction and architectural design.
9. At the appeal site, however, there is no notable or striking construction or design or consistency that warrants such juxtaposition. Additionally, in the example provided, the colour of the dormer construction materials closely matches the traditional roof slates, allowing them to blend harmoniously with the existing structure.
10. On my site visit, I observed that dormer windows are not a typical feature of properties in the area. However, there is a small dormer on the bungalow immediately adjacent to the appeal property. In contrast to the proposal, this dormer utilises the same materials as those used in the main construction of the building, allowing it to integrate harmoniously within the street scene at a relatively low level.
11. Overall, the proposed development would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. It is therefore contrary to the Householder Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (the SPD) and Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Local Plan for the Bradford District Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2017 (the Local Plan) which amongst other things require good design and development that is appropriate to its context in terms of design, scale and materials.

Other Matters

12. The principle of amalgamation of the two dwellings to form a single dwelling was not opposed by the Council. I find no reason to disagree with this conclusion.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan due to the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area. There are no material considerations which indicate otherwise. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

F P Tinsley

INSPECTOR