



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 May 2023

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/N3020/D/23/3315641

15 Park Road, Woodthorpe, Nottinghamshire, NG5 4HR

- 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 Lee Tombs against the decision of Gedling Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/0641, dated 7 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'loft conversion.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. The Council's decision refers to the development as a 'loft conversion and front and rear facing dormers' and as this describes the proposal in more detail, I have considered it on this basis.

Reasons

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. The development plan includes policy 10 of the Council's Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan and policy LPD 43 of its Local Planning Document Part 2 Local Plan. Together these seek to ensure that development makes a positive contribution and has regard to the character, architectural style and detailing of its context. The National Planning Policy Framework also seeks to encourage high quality design. Those policies are relevant to all residential alterations requiring planning permission, including this proposal.
4. The appeal site comprises a detached house built in the inter-war period and is one in a row of several similar dwellings on this side of Park Road. It is of a modest size and scale with a steeply pitched main roof and a gabled roof over projecting bay windows. The projecting gables of these houses are a distinctive and dominant feature, contributing positively to their character and giving a sense of rhythm to the street scene.
5. The Council's refusal concerns a proposed dormer on the front facing roofslope and which forms part of the proposed loft conversion. It would extend across most of the width of the roof and would sit only very slightly below the main ridge. It would have three windows with a row of six solar panels above in the mono pitch roof.

6. At my visit I noted that the appeal dwelling has a window at second floor level in its side gable end and that the adjacent dwelling at no 17 has a front rooflight. However, I saw no other dormers in the front roofslopes of dwellings on this side of the road and the roofline is broadly consistent.
7. The siting of the proposed dormer in this roofslope would be uncharacteristic of the architectural style of this dwelling. It would be clearly seen from the street and would compete with and detract from the gabled projection which should remain the dominant feature. Its width would be excessive and disproportionate to the scale of the roofslope and this would further exacerbate its impact. As such it would appear at odds with the character and appearance of the dwelling and would appear overly dominant in the street scene.
8. The examples referred to in Appendix 05 by the appellant differ from this case in that they relate to Victorian-style dwellings in which dormers are a more common feature. In any case those shown are significantly smaller in scale than proposed here. The examples referred to in Appendix 6 also differ in that the dormer at Woodthorpe Manor is much smaller and sited on a side elevation and whilst the other dwellings may be of a similar period to the appeal dwelling, those dormers are sited on catslide roofs which is typical of that period. Those examples therefore have a different context from this site and do not provide justification for overriding the harm which would occur here.
9. This is a poorly sited and designed proposal which shows a lack of understanding of the architectural style of the dwelling. I conclude that, by reason of the siting, scale and design of the front dormer, the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area, contrary to the development plan policies referred to earlier.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh this. It would also fail to accord with the Framework. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector