
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2025 by A Morrison MTCP MRTPI

Decision by E Grierson BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/25/3365581

303 Fell Lane, Keighley, Bradford BD22 6DB

- 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 Iqbal against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00348/HOU.
 - The development is dormer windows to front and rear and installation of lift and wall to front.
-

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

3. The application was submitted retrospectively, and I saw during my site visit that the development, subject of this appeal, had been carried out. I have therefore considered the appeal on a retrospective basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is a two storey detached dwelling located on a sloping residential road comprising of properties of varying size and design. Two front and two rear dormer windows have been added to the building's roof, all of which are of matching dimensions and appearance. Owing to a combination of its considerable size, its elevated position above the highway and the spacing to its sides, the dwelling has a notable prominence within the local street scene.
6. I note that the Council has previously granted planning permission under two separate applications¹ for the erection of front and rear dormer windows together with the installation of an external staircase and lift. I observed that these developments have however not been carried out in accordance with their approved plans. From a review of the evidence, I understand that there is no

¹ Refs 20/01927/HOU and 21/03729/HOU

dispute between the parties regarding the acceptability of the lift and associated surrounding wall as built, and I see no reason to disagree with this conclusion. My main assessment will therefore focus on the dormer windows as constructed.

7. The height of each dormer is such that they are only slightly set down from the house's ridge, whilst their lower edges are also set close to the eaves line. When this height is taken together with their significant width, the overall massing of these developments cumulatively occupies most of the building's front and rear roof slopes. This substantial new bulk has resulted in a top-heavy appearance to the house, in doing so harmfully dominating and overwhelming its simple pre-existing original roof form.
8. All of the dormer enlargements have windows of a contrastingly shallower height than those below on the house. The tiled dark grey cladding beneath these windows, also the finishing material for the dormer cheeks, is itself of inconsistent dimensions and does not harmonise with the appearance of the dwelling's roof tiles or main walls. I did not observe any closely comparable examples of such cladding to dormers within the vicinity of the site. The detailed design elements of the dormers therefore further reinforces their incompatibility with the host property.
9. I recognise that the dormers as erected are of a similar width to those previously approved by the Council and that the appeal dwelling is of an individual style within a road which features a wide range of house types. However, this does not provide a justification for the development as carried out, which through its increased height, use of cladding on the front elevation and unsympathetic overall design, harms the host property's appearance and consequently negatively impacts its contribution to the character of the wider area.
10. On this basis, I conclude that the dormer windows are harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. The development conflicts with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Bradford District Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2017, which together seek for development to be of a good quality design that is appropriate to its context in terms of scale, details and materials. The development is also contrary to the general aims of the Householder Supplementary Planning Document, which advises that the size and form of dormer windows should maintain or improve the character and quality of the original house and wider area, including through restricting cladding to their sides only.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Morrison

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

E Grierson

INSPECTOR