



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 July 2022

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25TH July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/M2325/D/22/3299323

24 Norfolk Road, Lytham St Annes, Lancashire FY8 4JG

- 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 Ms Charlton against the decision of Fylde Council.
 - The application Ref 22/0230, dated 17 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension, formation of two side dormers, installation of 3no.triangular windows, extension to existing garage and formation of new driveway.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed dormers on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and streetscene.

Reasons

3. No.24 Norfolk Road (No.24) is a two-storey detached property on the north side of Norfolk Road. It has a uniformity in appearance with its neighbours, sharing strong characteristics including a prominent projecting bay window, a steeply pitched roof profile, a redbrick and render finish and rear outriggers. The proposal is to add a dormer window to both side facing slopes of the rear outrigger of No.24.
4. The guidance in the Council's *Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document (2007)* (SPD) is that, in general, dormers should be well contained within the body of the roof and not normally occupy an area which is greater than 35% of the area of the plane of the roof into which it will be sited. Although I recognise that the SPD guidance is just that, the proposed dormers would extend almost the full length and depth of each roof plane, set in only a minimal distance from its edges. In conflict with the SPD guidance, it would occupy greater than 35% of the area, all but filling the existing roof planes.
5. The dormers have been designed with a very shallow roof pitch which would be finished in tiles to match the existing. Notwithstanding this, its minimal off set from the ridge of the host dwelling means that the characteristic steeply pitched roof profile would be barely discernible instead dominated by the dormers. Although designed with a white sand and cement render to match the

host dwelling, the contrast between this and the red brick of the flank elevations below would be stark emphasising the excessive size of the proposed dormers.

6. I observed on site that because of the generous spacing between No.24 and its neighbours at No.22 and No.26 Norfolk Road there are clear views of the rear outriggers; they form an important part of the composition and character of the streetscene. I accept that each of the dormers would only be viewed one at a time from Norfolk Road but that view would be much more than 'fleeting' as suggested by the appellant. The scale of each dormer relative to the host roof plane means that even individually they would appear a prominent and unsympathetic addition to No.24, causing significant harm to its character and appearance and that of the wider street scene.
7. The guidance at paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is that planning decisions should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character, including the surrounding built environment, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change. I have had regard to the appellant's argument that the existing loft conversion does not meet Building Regulations, a new roof is needed and the proposed dormers would provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers of No.24. Whilst this may be the case, I am not persuaded that the size of dormers proposed is needed to achieve the improvements sought. They do not comprise the appropriate change as envisaged by paragraph 130 because, for the reasons given above, they are not sympathetic to local character.
8. The appellant further makes the case that a single dormer would be within the permitted development dimensions. I do not, however, have calculations before me for the cubic content of the original and proposed roofspace, nor any evidence that the construction of a single dormer would constitute a genuine fallback position. I have therefore considered the proposal that is before me on its own merits.
9. In conclusion on the main issue, the proposed dormers would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider streetscene. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy GD7 of the Fylde Local Plan to 2032 (incorporating Partial Review) (2021) which expects development to be of a high standard of design, relate well to the local context and avoids demonstrable harm to the visual amenities of the local area. It would also conflict with paragraph 130 of the Framework in so far as it requires that decisions should ensure new developments are sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

10. I note that the appellant feels that there was no opportunity to have a constructive dialogue with the Council during the course of determination of the planning application, or an opportunity to make amendments that could have addressed the Council's concerns. Whilst I have sympathy with this, it has no bearing on my findings above in respect of the main issue.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

R Jones INSPECTOR