
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 July 2020 by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/M0655/D/20/3253693

47 Victoria Road, Stockton Heath, Warrington WA4 2AL

- 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 Lisa Short against the decision of Warrington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/36345, dated 7 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is the removal of existing dormers in preparation for hip to gable loft conversion including new front and rear dormers.
-

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.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed front dormer on the character and appearance of No 47 Victoria Road and the wider area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling located within a residential area which is predominantly characterised by two-storey semi-detached dwellings of similar character and appearance. Permission is sought for various works to the roof. However, the Council has only raised concern with the proposed front dormer and consider it would be of an inappropriate scale, massing and design for the host dwelling and wider area.
5. The appeal dwelling has an existing front dormer which reads as a subservient feature in the roof due to its limited scale. The proposed dormer would be significantly wider than the existing, spanning much of the existing roof and part of the proposed extended roof. It would have a mono pitched roof falling from the ridge line of the original dwelling.
6. The Warrington UDP – Supplementary Planning Guidance – House Extensions (December 2003) (the SPG) notes that dormer extensions should always appear as subordinate elements of the roof, and their height and length should

be kept to a minimum. It also sets out design guidelines for dormers and I note the appellant has sought to meet these.

7. Nevertheless, the proposed dormer would have a considerable width, spanning approximately half of the roof plane. The mono pitched design of the roof would exacerbate its overall size as it would result in a bulky appearance. The proposed dormer would therefore dominate the front elevation and the proposed extended roof, thus failing to read as a subservient addition. Due to its scale and positioning it would be highly prominent from the public realm and it would appear at odds with the roofscape in the immediate locality. Therefore, this proposal would read as an overly dominant addition to the host dwelling and an incongruous addition in the wider street scene.
8. It is acknowledged there are examples of other front dormers within the locality. However, similar to the existing dormer at the appeal dwelling, they are subservient features that do not dominate the roof due to their limited scale. Many have also been designed to reflect the roof form and front gable characteristics of the host property. For the reasons noted above, the proposed dormer would fail to respect the form and appearance of the host dwelling.
9. Consequently, this proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area. It would therefore conflict with Policy QE7 of the Local Plan Core Strategy (July 2014) whose aim is, amongst other things, to ensure proposals are designed to enhance the character of the street scene and harmonise with the scale and proportions of existing buildings. It would also conflict with the guidance of the SPG as noted above.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has raised concerns over the Council's processing of the planning application and I note the submitted copies of emails between both main parties. However, this is a matter for the Council and I have determined the appeal strictly on its merits and have found it would cause harm as identified above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hannah Ellison

Appeal Planning Officer

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Susan Ashworth

INSPECTOR