
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 August 2022

By Terrence Kemmann-Lane JP DipTP FRTPI MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/K2610/W/21/3288087

8 and 10 Panxworth Road, South Walsham, Norwich, NR13 6DY

- 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 C Toms against the decision of Broadland District Council.
 - The application Ref. 20210224 dated 3 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is raising of roof ridge height to create upstairs accommodation including dormer windows in both Nos. 8 and 10 Panxworth Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters

2. The description of the development on the application form was given as "Ground floor and attic conversions at 8 and 10 Bungalows ... Pair of semi-detached on one ownership. New shed". This description is repeated on the appeal form. However, the council, on its refusal notice, gives the description of the proposed development as "Raising of roof ridge height to create upstairs accommodation including dormer windows in both numbers 8 and 10 Panxworth Road". This is the description that I have adopted in the heading above as it better describes the operational development that is proposed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is within the built-up area of South Walsham. The surrounding development consists of a wide mix of houses and bungalows with various additions, including a variety of dormer windows, mainly with gabled and hipped pitched roofs. The application originally proposed a single flat roofed dormer that extended across both bungalows. The council indicated that this was not acceptable, and suggested that the dormers could be sited in the rear roof slope.
5. This was rejected by the appellant on the grounds that the rear placement would not get the benefit of solar gain, but would result in shadowing of the rear garden, and privacy in the back gardens would be lost. In connection with the last point, I note that the next-door bungalow, at No.12, has a dormer in

its rear roof slope. However a revised scheme was submitted showing individual front dormers with a single pitched tiled roof for each bungalow. This is the scheme that the application was decided against and is now subject of this appeal.

6. The refusal was on the single issue of the quality of the design in respect of the effect on the street scene and character of the area. The development plan policies quoted seek a high standard of design. These policies are in line with the National Planning Policies Framework that, at paragraph 126, states "*The creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities*".
7. The revised design has merit in separating the dormers into 2 individual elements, reflecting that the 2 bungalows are separate dwellings and reducing the impact of the original bulky structure. The pitched tiled roofs are also an improvement since they reflect a traditional form of dormer and relate to the original pitched roof of the bungalow. However, they remain large, extending across most of the roof area of each bungalow, thus being a dominating top-heavy feature, out of scale with the existing dwellings, and over-prominent as a result. The one possible advantage of front dormers that I would accept, making them preferable to the appellant, is the solar gain point, but this is not of sufficient weight to overcome the poor design that is put forward.
8. Examples that are put forward of similar structures on existing properties seem to be from earlier decades, and generally illustrate poor design which current policy seeks to avoid. I can readily see the advantages to the appellant that would accrue from the submitted scheme, but the effect of the proposed development would be harmful to the street scene and the character and appearance of the surrounding area, and this public harm outweighs the personal benefits of the scheme, and means that planning permission should not be granted. I will therefore dismiss the appeal.

Terrence Kemmann-Lane

INSPECTOR