



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 November 2020 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/W3710/D/20/3258239

64 Amberley Avenue, Bulkington, Bedworth, CV12 9QY

- 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 Martin Stockley against the decision of Nuneaton & Bedworth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 037190, dated 11 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 31 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is a flat roof dormer to front elevation.
-

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 main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and the locality.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The section of Amberley Avenue around the appeal site consists predominantly of semi-detached bungalows, including the appeal property, with two-storey semi-detached properties further down the street. The group of bungalows in between Arundel Street and the two-storey dwellings all have hipped roofs and some, including the appeal property, have front gables. Of this group, No 69 has a flat roof front dormer and No 73 has a pitched roof front dormer. The remaining bungalows do not have front dormers. The group of bungalows have a cohesive appearance and rhythm which makes a significant contribution to the character of the street.
 5. The proposal would see the erection of a flat roof front dormer erected at the appeal property. The flat roof would be at odds with the existing hipped roofs and front gables of the appeal property and the other bungalows in the street. Furthermore, the proposed uPVC panels would not match the materials of the existing property. Consequently, the proposal would be discordant with the appeal property and the street scene and would detract from its character and appearance.
-

6. I acknowledge that the dormer at No 69 is finished with white uPVC panels. However, the Council states that this dormer was erected without planning permission. Moreover, this is the only such flat roof front dormer in this group of bungalows and accordingly it does not reflect the predominant form of development. It seems to me that the addition of any additional flat roof dormers, or dormers finished with white uPVC panels, would further erode the cohesive appearance and rhythm of the street.
7. The appellant refers to 14 front dormer windows in the estate of which 13 are have flat roofs, and my attention has also been drawn to photographs provided by the appellant of dormers that are described as poor design that have nevertheless been constructed. Apart from the dormers at Nos 69 and 73, no other details of these dormers have been provided, such as their location or details of any planning permission that has been granted. I agree that these structures are not good examples of development to follow. Nevertheless, they do not justify the proposal before me, which has been determined on its own merits.
8. For these reasons the proposed development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the locality. As such the proposal would conflict with Policy BE3 of the Nuneaton & Bedworth Borough Council Borough Plan (2019), which requires development proposals to be designed to a high standard and to contribute to local character. The proposal would also fail to accord with the guidance of section 13.10 of the Sustainable Design and Construction Sustainable Planning Document (2020), which states that extensions and alterations should not introduce a dormer window that fails to match or reflect the original property in design and materials.

Other Matters

9. I note the appellant's concerns regarding the Council's handling of the case. However, this is a matter that would need to be taken up with the Council in the first instance, and in determining the appeal I have only had regard to the planning merits of the case.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

D Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

S Ashworth

INSPECTOR