
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 September 2022

by M J Francis BA (Hons) MA MSc MCIfA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 October 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A2335/D/22/3303579

59 Gringley Road, Morecambe LA4 4SE

- 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 Mrs A Cross-Rainford against the decision of Lancaster City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00330/FUL, dated 11 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 May 2022.
 - The development is described as Proposed dormer to front with single storey extension to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the dormer extension on the dwelling and the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached bungalow located on a housing estate of similar style properties. The dwelling has a render finish, with a stone feature panel on the front elevation. To the rear, is a render covered, flat-roofed dormer and a pitched roof single storey extension.
4. The proposal seeks to construct a large, flat-roofed, dormer extension on the front roof slope, again in a render finish. Whilst the appellant considers that the dormer would be sited well below the roof ridge, set back from the eaves and does not extend to the sides of the roof, it would cover much of the front roof slope. This, despite having windows smaller than those found on the ground floor of the bungalow, would create an unbalanced and dominant feature to the dwelling.
5. Whilst the proposed render finish could be seen to harmonise the dormer with the existing dwelling, it would instead appear bulkier and visually increase the prominence of the development. The impact of this would be compounded because of the property having an existing rear dormer extension. The combination of the two, when viewed from the side, would make the development on the roof appear top heavy and incongruous in this location. This would harm the appearance of the dwelling.
6. The position of the appeal site, No 59, with its neighbour to the west, No 61, results in their driveways being adjacent to each other. This provides a gap where the side elevation of No 59 and the proposed and existing dormer would

be highly visible. The site is also located opposite a road junction. Therefore, the proposal would be more widely observed than other properties not similarly sited.

7. The appellants have provided examples of front dormers on Gringley Road and adjoining streets and makes particular reference to the dormer at No 55 Gringley Road. I viewed the dormers on Gringley Road. I noted that there are a number of properties in the area with front dormers and in some cases, with both front and rear dormers. I am, however, not aware of the details of these dormer extensions and I must determine the appeal based on its own merits.
8. Whilst appreciating the reasons for the appellants wishing to provide further space and remain in their home, and the potential economic and social benefits of the development, the design of the dormer is inappropriate and overly dominant on the roofscape. This would harm the character and appearance of the area.
9. Therefore, in relation to the main issue, the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the house and the area. It would not comply with Policy DM29 of A Local Plan for Lancaster District, 2011-2031, adopted July 2020, which requires development to contribute positively to the identity and character of the area through good design.

Other Matters

10. The appellants have provided information on permitted development guidelines for dormer extensions, although acknowledges that this does not apply to front dormers. This is therefore not relevant in this case and does not affect my assessment of this appeal.
11. The appellants have said that they would accept a condition for a different material finish to the dormer, if it was allowed on appeal. This would not, however, override my concerns regarding the harm caused by the dormer extension to the host property and the area.
12. I acknowledge that the Council has not raised concern in respect of the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of nearby occupiers. This is however a neutral factor which does not weigh in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

13. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

M J Francis

INSPECTOR