

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2023

by John Whalley

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20.10.2023

Appeal ref: APP/B3410/D/23/3327268

36 Burton Road, Branston DE14 3DN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal of planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Toseaf Mohammad against the decision of East Staffordshire Borough Council.
 - The application, ref. P/2022/01323, dated 14 November 2022, was refused by a notice dated 23 June 2023.
 - The development is: Raising of ridge height to facilitate a loft conversion including hip to gable enlargements, two front facing dormers and rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The decision turns on the effect of the roof extension of the dwelling at No. 36 Burton Road on the appearance of the street scene.

Appeal property and roof extension

3. No. 36 Burton Road is a detached house fronting the north-western side of the road. Housing along both sides of the road is a mixture of designs of mostly detached dwellings. The houses display a variety of sizes, roof types and heights. They include hipped roofs, gabled roofs and roofs with dormer windows.
4. The roof extension project at No. 36, the subject of this appeal, appeared to have been completed. As the Appellant, Mr Toseaf Mohammad said and earlier Google Maps photography show, his home at No. 36 had a fully hipped roof. A hip to gable conversion has been carried out, with eaves 5.55m high and a ridge 8.91m high. Two dormer windows have been built into the long front roof slope.

Considerations

5. Mr Mohammad said the hip-to-gable conversion carried out at No. 36 was not incompatible with the existing roofscape and street scene along this section of Burton Road. I agree that such a conversion can be of considerable utility and could even improve the appearance of a dwelling. I do not share his view, however, that whilst in the present case the dormer windows do not look

excessively large, they have been built into an incongruously long and high roof slope that is disproportionally dominant, especially in relation to the dwelling on each side. The result is, as the Council said, that the extension works to the roof have been built to a design that is an unfortunately discordant feature in the immediate street scene.

6. I consider that the resulting appearance of the extended house at No. 36 Burton Road fails to comply with guidance in local and national policy drawn up to ensure the application of good design.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons outlined above, the appeal is dismissed.

John Whalley

INSPECTOR