



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2019

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/B3410/D/19/3235517

10 Park Road, Barton under Needwood, Burton-on Trent DE13 8DW

- 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 & Mrs Richard Ford against the decision of East Staffordshire Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P2019/00506, dated 28 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is extension and alteration to first floor dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached dormer bungalow, one of a row of three properties to the same design. The area is residential in nature, with properties of various types and designs. The appeal proposal would alter and extend the existing dormer to increase the size of the dormer and add a pitched section to both ends of the extended dormer.
4. Policy SP24 of the East Staffordshire Local Plan (2015) (the LP) deals with design and, amongst other matters, states that development proposals should reinforce character and identity through local distinctiveness whilst Policy DP3 deals with the massing of development, in terms of the shape, volume and arrangement of the building in relation to the context.
5. The row of three detached dwellings enjoy a symmetry in relation to the size and design of the dormers for the bungalows. The alterations to the dormer would increase its size considerably across the majority of the width of the property and introduce two pitched dormer sections, which would visibly jar with the simple design and layout of the existing row of properties. I find that design of the appeal proposal to be unsympathetic and would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area by unbalancing the proportions and design of the row, and as the central property of three, the harm would be magnified and unbalance the street scene as a whole.

6. As a result, I find that the proposals are in conflict with Policies SP24 and DP3 of the LP, and the design and amenity aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

7. I have noted the comments of the appellant in relation to the maintenance issues caused by the existing dormer, and that the proposals would enhance the appearance of the dwelling. However, taking into consideration the existing character and appearance of the locality, focussed on the row of dormer bungalows, I find that the harm caused by the alteration would outweigh any issues brought forward by the appellant in support of the proposals.

Conclusion

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

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR