



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 20 July 2021

by A Caines BSc(Hons) MSc TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/E2734/D/21/3273804

7 Kirkham Place, Harrogate HG1 4EN

- 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 & Mrs Cheung against the decision of Harrogate Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00449/FUL, dated 1 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with hip to gable and front and rear dormer extensions (Revised Scheme).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. A revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has been published since the appeal was lodged. I am satisfied that the revisions to the Framework do not prejudice the positions of the parties in respect of the issues raised in this appeal, so it has not been necessary to seek further comments on this change.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a semi-detached bungalow located within a residential cul-de-sac containing similar semi-detached bungalows and two-storey houses. The proposed loft conversion works would include a hip-to-gable roof extension and dormers to the front and rear. However, only the front dormer window features in the Council's refusal reason, and I note from the planning officer's report that the hip-to-gable extension and rear dormer may be permitted development. I shall therefore confine my considerations in this appeal to the proposed front dormer.
5. From the information before me, it appears that the Council has previously granted planning permission (ref: 20/03709/HPC) for two pitched-roof dormers within the front roof slope of the appeal property. In contrast, the appeal scheme seeks a larger flat-roofed front dormer of materially different scale and design.

6. The Council's House Extensions and Garages Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2005 (SPD) provides advice on the design and form of dormer windows. It advises that where dormers are acceptable they should not be so large that they dominate the roof, and that generally, wide flat-roofed dormers are unacceptable.
7. Although the proposed dormer would be set in from the top, eaves and sides of the extended roof, it would still be a wide, flat-roofed structure of considerable bulk within the front roof slope. It would be clearly visible from Kirkham Place and at the junction with Kirkham Road where it would appear as a visually dominant and incongruous addition in a street where no such front dormers currently exist.
8. The appellant has cited several examples of flat-roofed front dormers in the wider area. However, they are not viewed in the same context as the appeal property, such that they exercise only a limited influence on the character and appearance of the area surrounding the appeal site. I also note that there were no objections from neighbours or other consultees, but this does not justify the harm that would be caused.
9. I conclude, that by reason of its scale and design, the proposed front dormer would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. In this regard, the proposal is contrary to Policies HP3 and HS8 of the Harrogate District Local Plan 2014-2035, and the SPD. Among other things, these require new development to protect local distinctiveness and to ensure that extensions, including dormer windows, do not have an adverse impact on the character or appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Caines

INSPECTOR