
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 February 2017

by C L Humphrey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 6th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A4520/D/16/3162349

11 Cloister Walk, Jarrow NE32 3AL

- 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 Mr Paul Kennedy against the decision of South Tyneside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref ST/0573/16/HFUL, dated 14 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with flat roof dormer roofs to front and rear elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The proposed development would result in the creation of a flat roof dormer window to both the front and rear of the appeal property, which is a 2 storey house within a short terraced block situated on the north side of Cloister Walk. Similar blocks of terraced houses are located to the east and west of the appeal site. The terraced blocks on this side of the street are characterised by their straightforward design and uniform red-tiled roofs, none of which appear to have been altered.
 4. Policy DM1(A) of the South Tyneside Local Development Framework Development Management Policies (LDFDMP) states that development should be designed to convey sensitive consideration of its surroundings, and where possible enhance its local setting and reinforce local identity, having particular regard to scale and proportions, alignment, form, use of materials and architectural detailing. With particular regard to roof extensions, the guidance contained within the South Tyneside Local Development Framework SPD 9: Householder Developments (SPD 9) states that dormer extensions should avoid 'top heavy' appearance and spoiling the character of the dwelling and goes on to say that if an area is not characterised by dormers of any kind, introducing an undesirable precedent should be avoided.
-

5. The dormer to the front would be of considerable width and only very slightly set down from the ridge, resulting in a top-heavy addition to the characteristic unbroken roofline of the appeal property and terraced block. Its horizontal form, off-set alignment and the proposed use of grey GRP or lead cladding on the cheeks and roof would not reflect the existing proportions, architectural detailing and roofing materials of the appeal property. As such, the proposed front dormer would be a dominant addition to the front elevation, resulting in the creation of a discordant and highly prominent feature within the street.
6. The Council has raised no objection to the proposed rear dormer and, given its less prominent location at the back of the appeal property, I have no reason to take a different view. However, the rear dormer would serve the proposed loft conversion and so is integrally linked to the overall scheme and thus not clearly severable from it. Therefore, a split decision permitting the rear dormer only would not be appropriate in this case.
7. Taking the above matters into consideration, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. As such, it would conflict with the design aims of Policy DM1(A) of the LDFDMP and the guidance contained within SPD 9.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C L Humphrey

INSPECTOR