
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 June 2021

by Diane Cragg DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B2002/D/21/3268938
15 Lindum Road, Cleethorpes DN35 0BW

- 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 and Mrs Drewett against the decision of North East Lincolnshire Council.
 - The application Ref DM/0944/20/FULA, dated 4 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is 'rear dormer to extension loft conversion'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development on (i) the character and appearance of the area; and (ii) the living conditions of occupiers of the adjacent residential properties with particular regard to privacy and outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Lindum Avenue is a residential street with a mix of detached and semi-detached houses set back from the road frontage behind small front gardens. Spaces between builds are relatively narrow so that garages are in rear gardens and many of the semi-detached properties have rear two storey outriggers.
4. Whilst each of the pairs of semi-detached houses along the row have different design details there are unifying features including the brickwork and rendered walls and the rosemary tiled pitched roofs with gable and hip details. Many dwellings, including the appeal property, have ornate ridge tiles. The resulting symmetry between pairs of houses and the common design features in the street provides a visually pleasing degree of uniformity which adds to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The appeal property is a semi-detached house with a gable roof to the front and side and extended outrigger with a pitch, hipped roof to the rear. The roof space of the property is already used as a bedroom which is lit by two small roof lights in the rear roof slope.
6. The proposed flat roof dormer would extend out from ridge height and up from the eaves line for the full depth, and most of the width, of the main roof. It

- would extend out over the rear outrigger retaining the hipped end but otherwise incorporating the outriggers pitched roof area. The space would be lit by French doors to the main room and high-level window to the en-suite.
7. Although the dormer extension would incorporate rosemary roof tiles to the walls when viewed alongside the attached neighbouring house, the additional high-level bulk of the proposal would result in the appeal property having an awkward top-heavy appearance. The combination of the altered roof form and the dormer spanning the original rear roof slope and the outrigger would result in a box like form that would have a discordant appearance on the roof and would harmfully erode the symmetry with the neighbouring property. The proportions of the French doors and the Juliette balcony would draw attention to the dormer and add to its 'top-heavy' appearance and prominence.
 8. I observed at my site visit that Lindum Road is slightly higher than Signhills Avenue to the rear. Whilst the dormer extension would only be glimpsed from Lindum Road because of the proximity between the side elevations of buildings it would be highly visible when viewed from the rear windows and gardens of adjacent properties. It would also be visible from Signhills Avenue between buildings. The proposal would result in the appeal property appearing unbalanced and visually dominant among the group of semi-detached houses. The pleasing degree of uniformity would be significantly undermined, and the proposal would fail to successfully integrate with its surroundings.
 9. I saw at my site visit the details of the dormer extension at 14 Signhills Avenue. No 14 is a more modest property and it does not have a rear outrigger. The dormer sits down from the roof line and in from the gable wall. Although the hipped detail has been removed its removal has allowed the dormer to be contained within the rear roof slope. I also note the other dormers within the area that have been brought to my attention. I accept that some of these do not sit comfortably within the roofscape, however, I observed during my site visit that these roof extensions are not a significant feature of Lindum Road and do not have an influence on the character of the area around the appeal site.
 10. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the area in conflict with Policies 5 and 22 of the North East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2013 to 2032 (adopted 2018) (Local Plan) where these policies seek to achieve a high standard of design.
 11. The appellant refers to compliance with paragraphs 118 and 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which support innovative design and seeks to maximise the use of land in urban areas by using the airspace above existing residential properties subject to the development being appropriate in its context. For the reasons I have set out, I consider that the proposal would conflict with these paragraphs of the Framework. It would also conflict with paragraph 127 of the Framework where it seeks to ensure that development will add to the overall quality of the area, be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and sympathetic to local character.

Living conditions

12. The rear dormer extension would be prominent from the gardens on Signhills Avenue. However, the relationship between the windows in the dormer are not significantly different to the windows in the first floor and no significant

overlooking would occur despite the size of the French doors. Moreover, the appeal site and its neighbours have relatively long rear gardens and the separation distances between properties are substantial.

13. Although it is a dominant addition that harmfully disrupts the character of the pair of houses and the character of the area, where the dormer projects out over the outrigger the dormer is set away from boundaries. The harm to the character and appearance of the area would alter the outlook from neighbouring gardens. However, the extent of such effects would not, overall, harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.
14. I therefore find that the development does not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties with regard to privacy and outlook and in this respect would accord with Policy 5 the Local Plan where it seeks to ensure development does not impact on neighbouring land uses.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR