
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 September 2019

by G Pannell BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/L2630/D/19/3232380

45 High House Avenue, Wymondham NR18 0HY

- 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 Andrew Cook against the decision of South Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/0932, dated 25 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 June 2019.
 - The development proposed is a dormer loft conversion to single storey detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Andrew Cook against South Norfolk District Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. 45 White House Avenue is a single storey dwelling sitting gable end onto the highway, located within a residential area comprising a mix of dwelling styles. The gable end siting is unusual in relation to neighbouring properties and the dwelling is positioned forward of its neighbour and this results in the length of the roof being exposed to the public realm.
5. The proposed dormer would be inset from each end of the roof and would include 3 windows. However, it would occupy most of the roof space and would look large, bulky and disproportionate to the dwelling. It would be highly visible from within White House Avenue and would appear as a prominent and incongruous feature within the street-scene.
6. Whilst other dormer windows are present within White House Avenue, a number of these are sited on rear roof slopes and are commensurate with the scale of the host dwellings and do not lead to the same impact on the character and appearance of the area. I was also able to see, during my site visit, the dormer window on the front elevation of a nearby property, 58 High Horse Avenue. I accept that this is visible from within White House Avenue, with

views across the open space which the dwelling fronts onto. However, I do not have the full details of the circumstances of that development and so cannot be sure that they represent a direct parallel to the appeal proposal, and in any event this example confirms that such dormer extensions can be detrimental to the character and appearance of an area and therefore should not be used as a reason to allow a similar development such as that before me.

7. It has been put to me that a similar development could be built under permitted development. However, I have no firm evidence that there is a permitted development scheme that would represent a realistic fall-back situation. Therefore, I have given this argument little weight.
8. In conclusion, the proposed dormer would harm the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area. Therefore, it would fail to comply with Policies DM3.4 and DM3.8 of the South Norfolk Local Plan Development Management Policies Document (2015), Policy 2 of the Joint Core Strategy for Broadland, Norwich and South Norfolk (2014) which all seek to ensure good quality design for developments and echo the requirements of paragraph 7 of the Framework and would result in a development which fails to maintain or enhance the character and appearance of the area.

Other matters

9. The appellant has raised that the Council refers to the increased roof height of the proposal, which they consider is inaccurate. However, I have taken this to mean that the dormer window has the effect of raising the pitched roof to create the dormer and I accept that the overall ridge height of the dwelling remains unaltered and I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Conclusion

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

G. Pannell

INSPECTOR