



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2019

by Elaine Worthington BA (Hons) MTP MUED MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q3060/D/19/3239222

7 Enthorpe Street, Nottingham, NG8 3HA

- 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 Mrs Uzma Bibi against the decision of Nottingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01432/PFUL3 (PP-07961370), dated 25 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as 'First amendment to approved application 19/00589/PFUL3 – to preserve as built DORMER. Brickwork to dormer to be coloured to match main house external walls. All as recently approved application 18/01846/PFUL – 12 Western Boulevard'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background

2. Planning permission was granted in May 2019 for a loft conversion with a hip to gable roof and a rear dormer which was reduced in size during the Council's consideration of that application (19/00589/PFUL3). The appeal proposal seeks the retention of that hip to gable roof along with a larger rear box dormer which has already been built.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the dormer on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey house at the end of a short terrace of four dwellings in a residential area.
 5. The dormer extends over the property's original rear roof and across the new roof that has been created by the hip to gable extension, right up to the flank wall of the house. As such, it almost entirely covers the rear roof plane. It has been constructed flush with the wall of the house from eaves level up to the top of the ridge of the roof with a red brick flank wall. This being so, whilst it appears as part of the property's flank elevation, the dormer has completely altered the property's roof profile and created an awkward squared off rear roofline. It has also introduced what is appreciated as a tall three storey flank elevation to the relatively modest two storey end of terrace property.
-

6. Despite the appeal property's relationship with nearby buildings, the dormer is clearly visible from Enthorpe Street. Whilst there is a mixture of semi-detached and terraced houses nearby, they are all two storey and I saw no examples of similar roof extensions in this part of the street. I also observed at my visit that the dormer is clearly visible from vantage points to the rear in Felstead Road.
7. Taking all these factors into account, I consider that the dormer is an unduly large and bulky addition that dominates the roof and overwhelms the appearance of the host property. It also appears at odds with the rest of the terrace and intrusive in the surrounding area where it stands out as an unsympathetic addition and incongruous feature that seriously detracts from the established character of the area.
8. I therefore conclude on the main issue that the proposal is harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. This is contrary Policy 10 of the Greater Nottingham Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan which states that new development should be designed to create an attractive, safe, inclusive and healthy environment (b). It is also at odds with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.

Other matters

9. The appellant refers to similar development nearby. In particular a hip to gable roof extension and rear dormer at 12 Western Boulevard which was permitted in 2018 (retrospectively). Although I appreciate the importance of consistency in the Council's decision making, I am not aware of the full circumstances that led to that permission, or to the other developments nearby that have been cited. As such, I cannot be sure they are the same as in the case before me. However, I note from the photograph provided that, in contrast to the appeal scheme, the extension at No 12 appears to be set down from the ridge of the main roof of the house. In any case, as I see it, these similar developments serve to illustrate how unsatisfactory the appeal scheme is and so justify the Council's concern to avoid more of them. Accordingly, these matters add no weight in favour of the appeal scheme.
10. I note that the appellant was unaware that the previously approved dormer had been decreased in size during the Council's consideration of that application. However, I confirm that the retrospective nature of the appeal scheme does not have any bearing on my findings.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all the other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elaine Worthington

INSPECTOR