

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2022

by J Bell-Williamson MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P1560/D/22/3293674

11 Fronks Road, Dovercourt CO12 3RJ

- 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 M Piggott against the decision of Tendring District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01834/FULHH, dated 23 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council indicates that the Tendring District Local Plan 2013-2033 and Beyond: Section 2 (the Section 2 Local Plan) was adopted during January 2022 and that this plan and Section 1 now form the development plan for the district. Consequently, as policies from the Tendring District Local Plan (2007) are superseded in full, I have relied on the policy referred to from the now adopted Section 2 Local Plan.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed dormer extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a three storey mid-terrace dwelling in a residential road of varied property types.
 5. Policy SPL 3 of the Section 2 Local Plan concerns sustainable design and includes the overarching requirement that all new development should make a positive contribution to the quality of the local environment and protect or enhance local character. More specifically, it requires amongst other matters that development should relate well to its site and surroundings particularly in relation to its siting, height, scale, massing, form, design and materials.
 6. Extensive views of the rear of the four-dwelling terrace of which No 11 is part are available from Lower Marine Parade. The visibility from surrounding views
-

is heightened by the difference in ground levels, with the terraced dwellings on higher ground than the road. The terrace is largely of uniform character and appearance with the main additions relevant to the current proposal being a small flat-roofed dormer to one end and a larger dormer with a pitched roof to the other end of the terrace.

7. This latter dormer, while relatively large, reflects the general character of the original terrace, with its pitched roof form and traditional design and appearance. The existing smaller dormer is much less prominent. The proposed dormer positioned in the middle of the terrace would be of more contemporary design with a flat roof and prominent glazing. This would result in it contrasting unfavourably with the more traditional appearance and form of the existing larger dormer. Consequently, the two features would compete visually with each other to the overall detriment of the appearance of the terrace.
8. The location of the proposed dormer in the middle of the eaves, positioned directly above a smaller first floor window and ground floor bay window would result in an incongruous relationship with the existing fenestration, resulting in a lack of visual integration into the existing built form of the appeal property. As such, this would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider terrace. Given the prominence of the terrace from surrounding views, these harmful effects would be readily apparent.
9. I acknowledge that there are examples of contemporary architecture in the surrounding area, notably the dwelling in front of the terrace. However, this a self-contained building the appearance of which would not mitigate the harmful effects of the dormer as a feature added to the existing terrace. Other examples referred to by the appellant do not form part of the street scene which includes the appeal property and, therefore, I give them limited weight for the purposes of determining this appeal.
10. Accordingly, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposed dormer extension would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. As such, it is contrary to Policy SPL 3 of the Section 2 Local Plan, as described above. It is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, which promotes good design.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeal should not succeed.

J Bell-Williamson

INSPECTOR