
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 April 2017

by John Dowsett MA DipURP DipUD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5th May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V0728/D/17/3167410

1 Frobisher Close, Marske by the Sea, TS11 7EG

- 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 and Mrs Glover against the decision of Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: R/2016/0635/RS, dated 28 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is dormer extensions to front and rear, including loft conversion and front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for dormer extensions to front and rear, including loft conversion and front porch at 1 Frobisher Close, Marske by the Sea, TS11 7EG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: R/2016/0635/RS, dated 28 June 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan (1:1250); Site Plan (1:500); 01 – Existing Plans and Elevations; and 02 revision A – Proposed Plans, Elevations and Section Scheme 2.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural matter

2. The planning application form describes the development as “Proposed porch, loft conversion and dormer to front” whilst the decision notice issued by the Council refers to it as “Dormer extensions to front and rear, including loft conversion and front porch”. The description used by the Council is more accurate and I note that this has been adopted by appellant on the appeal form. I have therefore used the latter description for the purposes of the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.
-

Reasons

4. The appeal building is one half of a pair of semi-detached two storey houses located within a short cul-de-sac. The house has an asymmetric pitched roof and an integral garage that projects beyond the main front wall of the house. The main roof of the house continues down, forming a steeply pitched roof over the garage. This results in the appeal building having an unconventional appearance. A porch with a shallower pitched roof has previously been added to the house in line with the front of the garage.
5. Within the cul-de-sac there are four pairs of, originally identical, semi-detached houses. At the head of the cul-de-sac are the rear gardens of houses in Grenville Close, and a small bungalow has been inserted adjacent to the turning head. The wider area consists of a later Twentieth Century housing estate with a range of house designs. Many of the properties in the area have been subsequently altered or extended, with the result that it is now very diverse in appearance and has no predominant defining character. I saw when I visited the site that in the surrounding area there are a large number of properties with front dormers in a range of sizes and designs and also a large number of large box dormers on the rear elevations of properties. Dormers, and in particular, large front dormers are therefore not an uncommon feature in the surrounding area.
6. The Redcar and Cleveland Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document 2013 (SPD), which has to be read alongside the more general design policies in the Redcar and Cleveland Core Strategy 2007 (Core Strategy), and the Redcar and Cleveland Development Policies Development Plan Document 2007 (DPDPD), sets out various requirements in respect of the design of domestic extensions. With regard to dormer windows the SPD is permissive of these on the front elevations of houses provided that they are proportionate to the existing roof and do not truncate existing roof forms. The SPD does not encourage full width box dormers on front elevations and requires that, generally, dormers on the front of houses are set in a minimum of 0.5 metres from the edge of the roof, the eaves and the ridge.
7. The proposed front dormer would not wholly meet these requirements as it would not be set in 0.5 metres from the edge of the roof. The design also incorporates a hipped roof which is not at the same pitch as the main front roof slope and would add a further level of complexity to the roof form of the appeal building.
8. Core Strategy Policy CS20 and DPDPD Policies DP2 and DP3 require that new development respects or enhances the character of the area and minimises any adverse impact on the overall character of the streetscape. Whilst the proposed development would not enhance the character of the area, within the context of the surrounding area where there are presently a substantial number of large front dormers of varied design, the development would be consistent with its current character.
9. Although the street originally contained four pairs of identical semi-detached houses these have been altered over time, particularly through a diverse range of small infill extensions on the ground floor front elevations on the majority of the houses which have significantly diluted the original uniformity of the street scene. I saw when I visited the site that there is an essentially similar extension on number 8 Frobisher Close. There is no evidence as to whether

this extension pre-dates the SPD, however, it is nevertheless now part of the street scene and the proposed extension would be consistent with this.

10. The appellant suggests that the proposed rear dormer would be permitted development. However, this is not a matter for me to determine in the context of an appeal made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and I am required to consider the scheme as a whole. Within the immediate surroundings there are a number of similar large box dormers on the rear elevations of houses and due to the configuration of the streets within the estate, many of these are readily visible. The proposed rear dormer on the appeal building would be largely concealed from public viewpoints by surrounding buildings and I note from the Council officer's report that the Council has not raised any particular concerns regarding this aspect of the scheme, nor has it raised any concerns in respect of the proposed porch. From the evidence before me, and from what I saw on my site visit, I have no reason to reach a different conclusion in respect of these elements of the scheme.
11. I therefore find that whilst the proposed development would not wholly comply with the requirements of the SPD, due to the context within which it would be located, it would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would consequently comply with the relevant requirements of Policy CS20 of the Core Strategy and Policies DP2 and DP3 of the DPD which seek to ensure that new development respects or enhances the character of the area and minimises any adverse impact on the overall character of the streetscape.

Other matters

12. I note from the Council officer's report that the Council do not consider that the proposed extensions would have an adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring houses and that the Highways Authority have not raised any objections to the proposal. From the evidence before me, and from what I saw on my site visit, I would agree with these conclusions.

Conditions

13. I have had regard to the conditions that have been suggested by the Council. In order to provide certainty as to what has been granted planning permission I have attached a condition specifying the approved drawings. In order to ensure that the proposed extension is in keeping with the existing building and surrounding area it is also necessary to impose a condition requiring that the materials used in the development match those of the existing building.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, subject to the conditions discussed above.

John Dowsett

INSPECTOR