



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2024

by K Mansell BA (Hons) MPhil TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/24/3338955

377 Wakefield Road, Stalybridge, Tameside SK15 3BL

- 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 Chris Costello against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00675/FUL, dated 19 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 19 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is conversion of existing loft space to create an additional bedroom with ensuite facilities forming a dormer extension to the front of the dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. No 377 is a two-storey semi-detached property prominently sited at the back edge of the pavement. The building has similar materials, height, form, and roof pitch to both the adjoining dwelling and the terrace immediately to the south. In particular, these dwellings have a regular rhythm of chimneys, an otherwise uninterrupted roof plain and an absence of front dormer windows. To its north is another small terrace of buildings of varying age, design and scale. These also lack front dormer windows. Consequently, the buildings along this stretch of Wakefield Road have an attractive, traditional and uniform character, which is prominent from the highway.
4. The appeal scheme would introduce a front dormer across the roof frontage of No 377. In the absence of any other front dormers on the adjoining house or the terraced blocks either side of the host dwelling, it would be an alien feature that would disrupt the presently unchanged roof profiles of the appeal property and the buildings that adjoin it. Whilst there are no buildings to the front of the appeal property and its roof would remain lower than the adjacent three storey building at No 379, the front dormer would nonetheless appear incongruous within the street scheme and detract from the simple vernacular of these traditional properties.
5. Furthermore, the Council's Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (2010) (RD SPD) provides advice on dormer design at Policy RED6. It includes guidance that whilst dormers to the property frontage are not encouraged, they should also not take up more than one third of the roof space. Flat roof dormers are

also not encouraged. However, the proposed dormer would extend across almost the entire width of the front roof slope. Coupled with its flat roof design, it would result in a large box like structure that would add significant bulk and massing to the house. It would fail to reflect the form and size of the original dwelling and represent a visually obtrusive addition to the host property. Even if it did not establish a precedent because each case must be assessed on its own merits, it would disrupt the roof profile of the house to the detriment of the street scene.

6. The appellant has drawn my attention to other properties within the vicinity and more widely within Tameside that also have front dormer windows. The closest of these is approximately 40 metres to the north on John Street. However, this dwelling is substantially set back from Wakefield Road, and is seen in the context of its own terrace rather than the appeal property, from which it cannot be seen. I also observed the front dormer windows to the properties on Hall Avenue, but these relate to buildings of a different type and character, namely mainly detached bungalows. They are also, along with the others identified by the appellant, not visible from the appeal property and in areas with a different character and appearance, and therefore not directly comparable with the proposal. Accordingly, these examples have not altered my overall decision.
7. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policies C1 and H10 of The Tameside Unitary Development Plan (TUDP) (November 2004). These policies require development to, amongst other matters, be of a high-quality design and complement the character and appearance of the area as well as reflecting the distinct townscape features of the locality and respecting the nature of the surrounding fabric. It would further conflict with guidance at Policies RED1 and RED6 of the RD SPD, which broadly require extensions to acknowledge the character of the existing house as well as setting principles for the design of dormer windows. It would also be contrary to Section 12 of the Framework, which broadly promotes the importance of good design.
8. In its reason for refusal, the Council refer generically to the Places for Everyone Plan, in draft at the time the decision was made. However, no specific policies have been referred to and I have insufficient evidence before me to demonstrate how the proposal would conflict with it. In any event, I find that the proposed development would be contrary to the TUDP for the reasons set out above.

Other Matters

9. I acknowledge that no third-party representations were received, and also the appellant's view that the appeal scheme received support from the community and would revitalise the building. However, these are not matters that would affect the harm that I have identified above and accordingly, they do not alter my findings.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole, and in the absence of material considerations to indicate otherwise, the appeal is dismissed.

K Mansell

INSPECTOR