
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2020

by Jillian Rann BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/20/3248622

14 Broadlea, Davyhulme M41 7BP

- 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 Ross Garner against the decision of Trafford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 99273/HHA/19, dated 7 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a roof dormer and rear velux balcony to create a bedroom with en suite in the loft of the existing property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description in the banner heading above is taken from the application form. The Council's decision was based on amended drawings, PL02a and PL03a, submitted during the application. The amendments included changes to the front dormer and the installation of rooflights instead of a balcony to the rear and, I consider, are accurately reflected in the description of the development on the Council's decision notice: 'Erection of a roof dormer to front elevation, rooflights on the rear roofslope and other external alterations'. I have considered the appeal on the basis of the amended drawings.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and its surroundings.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is one of two pitched roof, two storey houses, at the end of a cul-de-sac of detached, pitched roof bungalows. With the exception of rooflights, none of those existing properties have had extensions or alterations to their roof slopes. Despite some differences in the height and orientation of the appeal property and its neighbour compared to those other single storey dwellings, their simple, unaltered roof forms contribute to the overall simplicity and consistency which characterises the roofscape of the street scene.
5. With two relatively large pitched roof sections, linked by a flat roofed central section of almost the same height and depth, the overall scale, massing and width of the proposed dormer would give it an excessively large and bulky

- appearance, such that it would unduly dominate the front roof slope of the appeal building. Furthermore, the combination of those components, with their various roof forms, would give the dormer a highly irregular and awkward form and appearance. Notwithstanding the intended use of matching materials, the dormer would thus appear as an overly dominant, uncomfortable and highly incongruous addition to the appeal property, and in the context of the modestly proportioned houses and simple pitched roof forms in the wider street scene.
6. There are examples of both flat roofed dormers and forward-projecting gable features on other nearby streets. However, those existing features are simpler in appearance and smaller in scale relative to their host buildings, and they are not directly comparable in size or appearance to the larger, more complex dormer now proposed, which would be formed by combining elements of those existing simpler features. Therefore, their presence does not alter my conclusions regarding the harm that would arise as a result of the dormer form proposed in this case.
 7. The proposed development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the appeal site and its surroundings. It would therefore conflict with Policy L7 of the Trafford Local Plan: Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework, which require development to be of a high quality design, appropriate in its context, and with the Council's Supplementary Planning Document SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations, which states that dormer windows should be proportionate to the scale, and reflect the architectural character, of the original house.

Other Matters

8. The dormer would provide additional accommodation for the appellant and his family, and I have been referred to the limitations in that regard if the dormer were to be reduced in size or located to the rear. I also recognise the appellant's intention to introduce renewable energy production, and preference to locate the dormer to the front of the building, compared with a rear dormer which may be permitted development, to minimise overheating of the room, limit overlooking of neighbouring properties, and allow the installation of solar panels to the rear. However, those benefits which may arise from constructing the dormer to the front do not outweigh the significant harm to character and appearance that would arise as a result of the dormer proposed in this case.
9. The Council has not raised any specific objection to the rear rooflights or the proposed alterations to the side and rear windows. I have no reason to reach a different conclusion regarding those features based on the evidence and my own observations. However, that does not alter my conclusion regarding the harm that would arise as a result of the proposed front dormer.
10. The amended drawings which the Council based its decision on were not subject to publicity. However, as I have found the development to be unacceptable despite the amendments made, I consider no party would be prejudiced by my having based my decision on those amended drawings.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Jillian Rann
INSPECTOR