



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 January 2024

by K Townend BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th February 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J3015/W/23/3324888

56 Meadow Road, Beeston, Nottinghamshire NG9 1JT

- 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 Michael Holder against the decision of Broxtowe Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00038/FUL, dated 16 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 5 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion consisting of 2 new roof dormers in existing roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal proposal is for two roof dormers, one on the rear roof slope and one which would wrap around the side roof slope of the front projecting gable and the front roof slope of the house, described in the Council's decision as front/side dormer which I will, hereafter, refer to as the front dormer as it would be to the front of the property. From the evidence before me there is no dispute between the parties as to the acceptability of the rear dormer. I shall therefore confine my detailed considerations to the proposed front dormer.
3. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) came into force on the 19 December 2023 with a further change published on 20 December. The revised Framework is a material consideration which should be taken into account from the day of publication. The paragraphs most pertinent to this appeal are unchanged, other than their numbering. Having considered the revisions and in light of the principles of natural justice, in this instance I do not consider it necessary to invite any submissions from the parties on the revised Framework.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the front dormer on the character and appearance of the existing property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is one half of a pair of semi-detached houses set within a group of matching pairs. The group of matching pairs all have a consistent roof shape and the front elevation, including the two-storey projecting gable, is prominent on the street scene. One of the other dwellings within the group has evidence of a loft conversion but this is served by a dormer at the rear and roof

- lights to the front. The group of houses, albeit not designated heritage assets, retain their traditional features, rhythm and design and currently make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
6. The surrounding area is predominately residential though there are commercial ground floor units within the street scene and other uses within the wider area. There are a mix of house types, sizes and designs with some larger, individual buildings, and other groups of houses which are similar to each other. There are no other groups the same as the group containing the appeal site and the different house types and sizes in the area contribute to the character and appearance of the area.
 7. The proposed front dormer, albeit to be finished in materials to match the existing building, would result in the introduction of a large structure on the roof to the front of the property. The massing, design and position would dominate the roof slope and be visually intrusive drawing attention away from the traditional features and proportions of the appeal property and the group of houses. The front dormer would be the only one within this group and, therefore, would introduce a new, alien, and incongruous feature into the group of houses and would be prominent in the street scene. The proposed front dormer would, therefore, be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
 8. Altering the cladding or features of the front dormer, as offered by the appellant, would not reduce its massing or prominence in the street scene or temper the harm which results from the introduction of a dormer to the front elevation.
 9. I acknowledge that there are other properties with dormer windows to the front. However, the properties that I saw in the immediate area with existing roof dormers are either individual, larger, properties, not set within a group of similar designed houses or properties where the front dormers have been part of the original building and design approach, such as at the new 'Beeston Quarter' estate built near the railway line. I have not been provided with any evidence of front elevation roof additions which have been approved or added as later additions to properties within a group of matching houses. The appellant's photographs of other dormers, provided within the Statement of Case, do not clearly provide evidence of front dormers and are, therefore, materially different to the appeal before me.
 10. For the above reasons, the front dormer would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the existing property and the surrounding area. It would, therefore, be contrary to Policy 10 of the Greater Nottingham, Broxtowe Borough, Gedling Borough, Nottingham City, Aligned Core Strategies Part 1 Local Plan, adopted September 2014, which seeks to ensure that all development makes a positive contribution to the public realm, considering, amongst other matters, the massing, scale, proportions, materials, architectural style and detailing.
 11. For the same reason the proposal would be contrary to Policy 17 of the Broxtowe Borough Council Part 2 Local Plan, 2018-2028 which seeks to ensure that all development integrates into its surroundings and, in the case of householder development requires development to be of a size, siting and design that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of

the area, not dominate the existing building or appear over-prominent in the street scene, and seeks to ensure that dormers do not dominate the roof.

Other Matters

12. The proposal would provide two additional bedrooms each with en-suite shower rooms, which the appellant intends to make available as a House in Multiple Occupation and would, therefore, provide an opportunity for shared living and affordable accommodation within an area that has access to public transport and employers. However, the public benefits arising from two additional rooms would be limited and would not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the existing building and the area.
13. That the main parties agree that there would be no adverse effect on access and parking arrangements, flood risk or the living conditions of neighbouring residents, notwithstanding the objections received, are neutral matters and do not weigh in favour of the proposal.
14. The appellant has also drawn my attention to the industrial units that have been built near the site, adjacent to the railway line. I have not been provided with the details of the consent for these buildings or why the Council considered industrial development was appropriate on this site. However, the industrial units are adjacent to other industrial development and the railway line. Moreover, the presence of industrial units would not justify the appeal proposal and I have considered the appeal on its own merits.

Conclusion

15. For the above reasons, having had regard to the development plan as a whole, along with all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Townend

INSPECTOR