



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 June 2026

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 June 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/D/24/3351905

2 Broomfield Place, Bradford BD14 6PL

- 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 The Executor of Mr Bradley Greenwood (Deceased) against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01829/HOU.
 - The development proposed is a dormer window and UPVC cladding to existing extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a dormer window and UPVC cladding to existing extension at 2 Broomfield Place, Bradford BD14 6PL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01829/HOU.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development stated on the application form refers only to the as-built dormer, but the description stated on the appeal form and the decision notice includes reference to UPVC cladding to the existing extension. The Council's Delegated Report assesses the impact of both and the letter notifying interested parties of the planning application includes reference to each element. I have therefore taken that to be the description of development. Works have been completed on the site and accordingly I proceed on the basis that the development is a retrospective proposal.
3. It was evident at my site visit that the plans submitted contain some inconsistencies with what has been built in relation to the original dwelling. For example, the right-hand edge of the dormer as built does not line up with the right-hand end edge of the window below it as the plan suggests. Likewise, the door to the ground floor extension is in a different position relative to the same window than the plan shows. In addition, the material now present on the faces of the dormer is not the UPVC cladding shown on the plans and on the photo in the appeal submissions. In light of this, I have made my assessment of the appeal on the basis of what exists on the site, not what is shown on the plans.
4. Reason for refusal three refers to there being insufficient information to enable proper consideration of a gate/fence indicated on the plans. However, reference to such development is not included in the description of development. It would further appear that this matter has been addressed under a subsequent planning permission that has been granted¹, which was described as *front dormer window, replacement of front extension with front and side extension and amendments to*

¹ 25/03906/HOU

existing boundary treatment. I have not therefore considered the gate/fence as part of my determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

6. As I have noted above, the front and the two cheeks of the dormer have been reclad in tiles. At my site visit I could not establish with certainty whether these are slate coloured concrete (or similar) tiles, or slates. Slate was approved as the facing material under the planning permission which has subsequently been granted. However, such a material itself would be in contrast with the original roof, on which stone tiles are present. That being the case, I consider that the tiles which have been installed are visually acceptable and that they are of an appropriate colour.
7. If the appeal were to be dismissed, the options open to the appellant would be to remove the dormer window entirely or to reduce it in size to that which has been permitted under the subsequent planning permission. I consider there to be a real prospect that they would choose the latter option. The reduction in size would take the dormer closer to the maximum width of 3 metres that the Householder Supplementary Planning Document 2012 (SPD) advocates, but it would still exceed that figure by 0.5 metres.
8. The appeal dwelling forms one half of a back-to-back dwelling, with the other dwelling fronting onto Broomfield. To the uninformed eye, the appeal dormer appears as a dormer on the rear roof plane of a dwelling, and its prominence is consistent with such a location. From the public vantage points where the dormer is most visible, its width is generally not readily apparent. Instead, it is its side elevations which are more visible, and these reveal that the dormer is appropriately set down from the ridge and up from the eaves. As a result, reducing its width would not result in any material visual benefit.
9. The cladding to the ground floor extension contrasts with the stonework of the appeal dwelling and its adjoining dwelling. This contrast is clearly apparent on the approach to the appeal dwelling, where it returns to join onto the stone-built elevation. However, modern and traditional materials can, in-principle, interact in an acceptable manner. Furthermore, the use of the UPVC is limited in this instance and its colour matches with that of the windows of the dwelling and the fence, which also appear in the same views. Its visual relationship with the host dwelling and its surroundings is therefore acceptable.
10. For these reasons, I find the facing material and width of the dormer, and the use of UPVC on the extension, to be acceptable in terms of their impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Consequently, the development accords with Policies DS1 and DS3 of the Core Strategy 2017 where they collectively seek to achieve good design. Whilst I acknowledge the design guidance of the SPD with respect to dormers, I have set out why in this instance no harm has arisen. Thus, there is no conflict with the overarching design aims of that document.

Conditions

11. The Council has suggested that three conditions be imposed in the event that the appeal is allowed. However, the development has commenced, and I have found that the use of non-matching materials is acceptable. I have also made my decision on the as-built development for the reasons I have set out above, as opposed to what is shown on the plans. Therefore, none of the conditions suggested are necessary in this instance.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be allowed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR