



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 June 2021

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P2935/D/21/3271926

41 George Street, Amble NE65 0DW

- 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 Elaine Abrol against the decision of Northumberland County Council.
 - The application Ref 20/03046/FUL, dated 9 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is flat roof dormer to rear of property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I saw that the development had commenced and appeared to be substantially complete. I have dealt with this appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area, with due regard to the Amble Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The host property is a terraced house of an understated character. However, the terrace is representative of the historical development of the area. Terraces such as this are a characteristic of the evolution of the town, and as such contribute to the importance of the CA as a designated heritage asset.
5. Despite being located on the rear roofslope, the dormer is prominent in views from a public square located to the rear of the terrace, as is much of the rear roofslope of the terrace. The roofs of the terrace are generally unaltered, giving the roofslope an uncluttered appearance commensurate with the understated character of the buildings. There is a rear dormer on one of the dwellings which is visible from the public square, but this is of a limited scale and a design which complements the traditional appearance of the area.
6. In contrast, the proposed flat roofed dormer appears as a substantial box-like addition dominating the rear roofslope of the host dwelling. It is an obtrusive and incongruous feature which detracts from the uncluttered and traditional appearance of the rear roofslope of this extent of the terrace. Details such as the set back from the eaves and use of materials do not mitigate for the harm

arising from the inappropriate design of the dormer. There is some variation in the design of buildings along George Street, but even within this context the dormer appears as an unsympathetic feature within the roofscape. For these reasons, the dormer will also harm the character and appearance of the CA.

7. I saw that there were flat roofed dormers elsewhere in the area, including a dormer of a similar design at 33 Leazes Street. In my view the dormer at No 33, whilst permitted by the Council, also demonstrates the harm arising from developments of this nature and should not be used as a precedent to permit similar proposals. In any event, the dormers I observed are some distance from the appeal site and do not set a prevailing context for the site or the CA.
8. I acknowledge that the appellant erected the dormer in good faith as she did not realise that the property was in the CA. I am also mindful of the personal circumstances of the appellant and issues such as costs of the work and compliance with the building regulations. However, these considerations do not outweigh the harm I have identified.
9. I conclude that the proposal will lead to significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal will also harm the character and appearance of the CA, and whilst that harm is less than substantial, there are no public benefits which would outweigh that harm. The proposal therefore conflicts with the design and heritage requirements of policies S15 and S16 of the Alnwick District Core Strategy 2007, as well as policy BE8 and Appendix B of the Alnwick District Wide Local Plan 1997. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework with regards to achieving well-designed places as well as conserving and enhancing the historic environment.
10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR