



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2019 by AJ Sutton BA Hons DipTP DMS MRTPI

by P J Davies BSc Hons MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 14 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/19/3234956

481 Kings Road, Old Trafford, Manchester, M32 8QN

- 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 Aman Kapur against the decision of Trafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 96392/HHA/18, dated 12 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2019.
 - The development is described as 'Dormer window to rear roof slope'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. The development had been completed at the time the site visit was conducted.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effects of the development on the character and appearance of the existing building and surrounding area, and on the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling which has been extended to the side (two-storey) and rear (single-storey). It is located in a residential area where the street pattern to the front is fairly uniform. It is close to the junction of Norwood Road; the rear curtilages of properties on this part of Kings Road taper, to an apex formed by the junction of the two roads, to meet the straight boundary line of properties on Norwood Road. The dwellings on Norwood Road, in this area, are generally three storey and of an older period and architectural style, with the exception of 123 Norwood Road, a two-storey property, which appears to be a later addition.
6. The development is a flat roofed, box dormer window, covering a substantial part of the rear roof of the appeal property. It has two windows, the frames of

which match those of the host dwelling, and it is clad on all elevations in black tiles.

Character & Appearance

7. The dormer window dominates the building by virtue of its scale and design. Whilst the proportions of the windows may reflect the existing fenestration of the host building, the dormer does not complement the original building due to its overbearing dimensions, rectilinear style and poor choice of building materials, in particular, the cladding. As an unsympathetic addition, it significantly harms the appearance of the appeal property.
8. Although it is located at the rear of the property, the dormer window can be clearly viewed from local vantage points; at the junctions of Norwood Road, Kings Road and Hortree Road, and at the rear, through gaps between dwellings situated on Norwood Road. These views are localised and limited. However, the development was clearly visible despite the presence of summer foliage on existing vegetation at property boundaries. The inelegant design of the development is particularly noticeable in the street scene as, although properties in the area are of differing architectural styles, the area is characterised by pitched/hipped roofs, red brick and harmonising roof tiles. The dormer window, which essentially is a large black flat roofed box, is therefore at odds with this distinct local character and as such is harmful to the character of the area.
9. Whilst it is noted that some properties on Kings Road, near the appeal property, have roof extensions, it was observed that such alterations were limited in number. Furthermore, the few existing were mainly located on side elevations, and comprised small dormers with pitched/hipped roofs, constructed in materials which generally matched the respective host buildings. There is one existing dormer window on the rear elevation of a neighbouring property (495 Kings Road), however, it is smaller in scale to that on the appeal property and is constructed in brick with a pitched tiled roof.
10. In summary, the development is contrary to Policy L7 of the Trafford Local Plan: Core Strategy 2012 (Local Plan 2012) and Supplementary Planning Document SPD4: A Guide to House Extensions & Alterations 2012 (SPD 2012) as it harms the appearance of the host property and fails to enhance the character of the area.

Living Conditions

11. The rear of the appeal property is bounded by the rear garden of 121 Norwood Road. Whilst the respective boundaries may be slightly offset, with the side boundary fence of 121 Norwood Road meeting the rear boundary of the appeal property, the triangular configuration of the street pattern in this area reduces the distance between the respective properties, which are therefore situated in close proximity. The dormer window provides a high vantage point, overlooking the garden space with unobstructed views to the second floor window of 121 Norwood Road. Whilst shrubs and trees offer some screening, the position and scale of the dormer window combined with the close relationship of the dwellings, does increase the sense of being overlooked for those occupying 121 Norwood Road, resulting in a loss of privacy, particularly when using the garden space. The development, therefore, has a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of this neighbouring property.

12. Whilst it is noted that the dormer window at the rear of 495 Kings Road also overlooks the rear gardens of dwellings on Norwood Road, the distance between those particular properties is considerably greater than is the case with the appeal property and 121 Norwood Road.
13. It is therefore concluded that the development is contrary to Policy L7 of the Local Plan 2012 and SPD 2012 as it results in a loss of privacy that prejudices the amenities of the occupiers of the adjacent property.

Other Matter

14. Whereas, a similar proposal may be allowed by virtue of permitted development rights, I note that certain conditions would need to be satisfied. In the absence of any specific details about such a proposal I am unable to give this matter any significant weight.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. For the reasons outlined above, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

A J Sutton

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and concur that the appeal should be dismissed.

P J Davies

INSPECTOR