



Appeal Decision

by David Wyborn BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F0114/D/20/3246021

14 Oolite Road, Odd Down, Bath BA2 2UU

- 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 E Boyd against the decision of Bath & North East Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref 19/04735/FUL, dated 30 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion incorporating side and rear dormers to main roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In response to travel restrictions due to the COVID-19 pandemic I consider that this appeal can be determined without the need for a physical site visit. This is because I have been able to reach a decision based on the information already available. Both the appellant and the Council were given an opportunity to provide comments on this approach and I have taken any responses into account.
3. The submitted plans in respect of the proposal for 14 Oolite Road show the front, side and rear elevations both in existing and proposed form. There is also a cross section through the building showing the pitch of the proposed roof and the internal space that would be created at roof level.
4. Comparing the existing and proposed elevations, this shows, in addition to the rear and side dormers that are proposed, the pitch of the front, side and rear roof slopes would also be raised. This would have the effect of raising the ridge height so that it was not level with the attached property. Furthermore, the front and rear roof slopes would then not be flush with the roof slope of the mid terrace dwelling.
5. I sought the views of the main parties on this matter and the implications for the appeal. I have noted these responses and I intend to determine the appeal based on the submitted plans. I have also taken into account that the earlier permission also showed the changes to the main roof and this permission is extant.
6. The Council do not raise objection to the rear dormer and this would not be visible from the road. This has already been permitted as part of the earlier scheme and would not cause visual harm.

Main Issue

7. In the light of the above, the main issue is the effect of the roof alterations and side dormer on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons

8. Oolite Road consists mainly of two storey residential properties with a mix of terrace, semi-detached and detached buildings. These buildings generally have traditional pitched roofs, with few dormers visible from the road. Some properties have gables and some others have fully hipped roofs and the combination of buildings with their roof shapes provide a pleasant variation to the appearance of the road.
9. 14 Oolite Road is the end property of a terrace of three dwellings. The two end properties have fully hipped roofs and the terrace has a consistent ridge line across the combined structure. The properties are set back from the road and, while 10 Oolite has a front porch, the terrace has a general consistency of design and appearance that contributes positively to this part of the street scene.
10. The side dormer would project out from the hipped roof near to a position in line with the side wall of the dwelling and extend up towards the ridge of the extended roof. When viewed from the road in front of the house, the profile of the dormer, even with its hipped roof, would appear as quite a sizeable and bulky addition to the overall roof. Its form and prominence would detract from the generally consistent and balanced appearance of the roof profile which contributes positively to this terrace. In this way, the proposal would not be a sympathetic addition to the dwelling and thereby would harm the character and appearance of this section of the street scene.
11. Furthermore, the ridge height of the proposed side dormer would be about the same ridge height as the main terrace at the present time. This height of the dormer would exacerbate its presence in relation to the terrace as a whole. The side dormer addition, in combination with the raised ridge of No 14 and the different angle of the front roof slope compared to the mid terrace property, would cumulatively result in an incongruous and visually harmful scheme.
12. I have taken into account the alterations to the adjoining terrace of three properties and their impact on the character and appearance of this part of the street scene. These alterations include the central front dormer and the two storey flat roofed side extension. The profile, with the hipped ends to this original terrace, is still apparent. I do not consider the changes to this adjoining terrace and their effect on the character and appearance of the road justify the alterations to No 14 which, for the reasons I have explained above, would be harmful.
13. The Beeches is an adjoining road where the semi-detached properties generally have fully hipped roofs and so the permitted side dormer at 14 The Beeches would be visible within the street scene. I am not persuaded that this scheme demonstrates best practice in terms of design and should therefore be replicated nearby to a terrace building with a somewhat different character. In the present case, there would also be changes to the pitch and ridge of the roof. As a consequence, I attach limited weight to this planning permission.

14. In the light of the above analysis, I conclude that the roof alterations and side dormer would harm the character and appearance of the street scene. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy CP6 of the Bath & North East Somerset Core Strategy (adopted July 2014) and Policies D1, D2, D3 and D5 of the Bath & North East Somerset Placemaking Plan (adopted July 2017) which seek, amongst other things, that extensions must complement and enhance the host building.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, there are no material considerations that indicate the proposal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Wyborn

INSPECTOR