
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 May 2017

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16th May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/D/16/3163645

25 Acton Avenue, Appleton, Warrington, WA4 5PS

- 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 John Edelston against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/28750, dated 17 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is a front dormer to roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed dormer on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area.

Reasons

3. Policy QE7 of the Council's Local Plan Core Strategy (CS) (2014) seeks to ensure, amongst other things, that proposals harmonise with the scale and proportions of adjacent and/or existing buildings and are visually attractive. It is, in this regard, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to encourage good design and ensure that new development reflects its surroundings.
4. The appeal dwelling is a detached dormer bungalow set back from the road. The plans show that it has two rooms and a shower room in its hipped roof. The proposed development would enable an enlarged shower room through the provision of a front dormer window. The front elevation of the roof has no windows at present.
5. At my visit I saw that Acton Avenue has an attractive and spacious suburban character, comprising mainly semi-detached houses in styles dating from the 1930's and 1960's, together with a few detached bungalows. There is a mix of hipped and gabled roofs as well as two storey gabled front projections to some of the properties. I disagree with the Council that the predominantly unaltered roofscape of the bungalows makes a significant contribution to the character of the street. Rather it is the spaces between dwellings and their set back from the street behind generous front gardens and front hedged boundaries that

provide its most attractive features. In light of this and given the variety of dwelling styles in the street, I consider that the principle of a dormer in the front elevation would be acceptable.

6. However, my concerns relate to the siting, size, scale and proportions of the proposal which is too wide and does not relate well to the position or proportions of the existing ground floor windows. Its roof pitch is too shallow and does not reflect that of the more steeply pitched main roof. Its ridge height is almost the same as that of the main roof. Consequently it would appear oddly positioned and disproportionate to the dwelling, resulting in an incongruous addition that would not be sufficiently sub-ordinate to the dwelling.

Conclusion

7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed dormer would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area, contrary to policy QE7 in the CS. As such it would fail to accord with the development plan and the Framework as a whole and would not constitute sustainable development. I have taken into account all other matters raised but none is sufficient to alter the outcome of my findings. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector