
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 March 2021

by C McDonagh BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 April 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/U4230/D/20/3264299

1 Tetlow Grove, Eccles, Manchester M30 8GE

- 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 Dunn against the decision of Salford City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/75012/HH, dated 4 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is installation of additional pitched roof dormer to front elevation, re-pitching of hip roof to 60 degrees on side elevation and installation of flat roof dormer to the rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my site visit, it was clear that the development was largely complete, and the appeal is therefore considered on a part retrospective basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, end terrace property located on the corner of Tetlow Grove and Arthur Street. Planning permission was previously granted for a change of use of the property to 6 self-contained apartments with associated works to erect front and rear pitched roof dormers and a detached garage alongside other ancillary alterations.
5. Evidently, unauthorised works to construct a larger dormer than approved to the rear, an additional front dormer and alterations to the roof to transform the original hip to a gable were subject to a retrospective planning application which was refused by members of the planning committee. The proposal seeks to amend the 'as built' development, with the gable roof 're-pitched' to an angle of 60°, the rear dormer reduced in scale and to approve retrospectively the unauthorised front dormer.
6. There are a variety of house types in the local area. Tetlow Grove is comprised of a long, continuous terrace bookended by a pair of semi-detached dwellings to one side and a mix of semi-detached and terraces to the other. There is a

- general mix across the local area, with terraces, semi-detached and detached properties all visible from the junction of Tetlow Grove and Arthur Street. Roofs are comprised of either hipped or gable types, and while I did note the adjoining property had a rear dormer, the roofscapes facing Tetlow Grove and others in the area appeared largely unaltered.
7. The House Extensions Supplementary Planning Document (2006) (the SPD) advises dormer windows should be sited below the ridge line and set back from the eaves of the host building. Moreover, the use of a pitched or hipped roof can help improve the appearance of dormers.
 8. The rear dormer is prominent from Arthur Street and would be reduced in width from the gable side of the roof. This would reduce the bulk and mass at roof level. However, there appears to be little set down from the ridge or set back from the eaves of the host building proposed. As a result, it would lack subordination and appear to dominate the rear roof, despite the use of matching materials. This is compounded by the flat roof, which makes the dormer appear top heavy and overly dominant. Due to the prominent position of the proposal it would therefore cause harm to the character and appearance of the local area.
 9. While I am informed of many other dormers in the area, I have no details of these before me, nor did I see these on the site visit. However, I did observe the rear dormer on the adjoining property, although this appears much smaller in scale, covering approximately half of the roof width and is also set down from the ridge and set back from the eaves. As a result, I do not consider the adjacent dormer comparable to the proposal before me, nor would its existence justify allowing the harm I have identified.
 10. The appellant argues the property benefits from permitted development rights as specified in The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the Order). I have no reason to disagree with this. However, I have nothing before me to substantiate which section of the Order is relevant or which element of the scheme is permitted development. Regardless, it is not my role within the context of a section 78 appeal to determine the lawfulness of the proposal, and I have not been made aware of an application for a certificate of lawful development. As such, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the plans and evidence before me.
 11. The alteration to the as built gable would restore a hipped roof with an angle of 60°. Evidently the angle of the original hipped roof prior to the alterations was 45°. The difference therefore would be minimal, and I observed variety in the angles of hipped roof in the area on my site visit. As such, the alteration proposed to the gable would not appear incongruous when viewed from public vantage points, despite the prominence of the property at the end of the terrace.
 12. The additional front dormer matches that approved, which is of small scale with a pitched roof. I note in this regard the unauthorised structure is in accordance with the SPD which advises a pitched roof can improve the appearance of dormer extensions, while splitting them into two can reduce the impact of larger dormers. Although there is little set down from the ridge, I note this height matches that of the approved dormer and any additional set down would appear unbalanced. Moreover, there is a suitable set back from the eaves and

the appearance of two smaller dormers over one large extension allows some of the original roof form to be legible while being subordinate to the host. As such, the front dormer does not adversely affect the character and appearance of the local area.

13. Notwithstanding the lack of harm arising from the additional front dormer and alteration to the gable, and to conclude, the rear dormer would cause harm to the character and appearance of the local area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies DES1 and DES8 of the City of Salford Unitary Development Plan. These seek to ensure alterations and extensions to existing buildings respect the general scale, character and proportions, among others, of the original structure and complement the general character of the surrounding area.

Conclusion

14. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C McDonagh

INSPECTOR