

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 June 2024

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/24/3342504

9 Boyds Walk, Dukinfield, Tameside SK16 4TW

- 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 A. Allcock against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 24/00129/FUL, dated 15 February 2024, was refused by notice dated 9 April 2024.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion including large roof dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The property is a semi-detached, two storey dwelling with a hipped roof. This part of Boyds Walk is characterised by the numerous similar properties that remain relatively unaltered and retain the original rhythm of the street with regard to the buildings and the spaces between them, particularly at roof level. The proposal would remove the side facing hip and replace it with a gable. The proposed rear dormer would extend to the edge of the new gable. Whilst the removal of the hip would be at odds with the existing character of this area, the combination of the gable and full height cheeks of the dormer would represent a form of development that would appear incongruous and would represent poor design in this context. Although views of the dormer and side facing gable together would be limited due to the position of the neighbouring property, they would be available and the works would detract from the character and appearance of the area.
 4. The proposal would be contrary to the general design objectives of policies H10(a) and C1 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan 2004, particularly as it would fail to have regard to the townscape character and the relationship between buildings; and would not be of a high quality design that would complement the character of the surrounding area. It would also conflict with the more specific requirements of policies RED1 and RED6 of the Tameside Residential Design: Supplementary Planning Document 2010 as the dormer
-

would dominate the roof slope and its design and size would not reflect the architectural style of the building. The elements together would significantly alter the perceived scale and mass of the dwelling. The *National Planning Policy Framework* 2023 is clear that development that is not well designed should be refused.

5. Reference has been made to other roof alterations in the area. A property in Lakes Road appears to have had similar alterations but I do not have information as to the circumstances that led to those works. It is also not central to a row of properties such as these and is in an area of more diverse property designs. It is screened to some extent by neighbouring trees. I am not clear if this is the example referred to by the appellant as address and planning permission details have not been provided. There is a similar style of dormer also in Lakes Road but it is of a smaller scale without a hip to gable extension and may not have required permission. A dormer in Glenmore Grove is of a similar scale but that property does not have a hipped roof and as such, it also may not have required consent. In any event, I must consider this proposal on its own merits.
6. I am mindful that certain works to this property could be carried out without the need for formal consent. However, in combination, these works do need permission and therefore must be considered against the council's policies and those of the *Framework*. I am mindful that the proposal would result in enhanced accommodation that would result in both social and economic benefits. However, whilst I have had regard to the matters that weigh in favour of allowing alterations to the property, including the lack of objections locally, they are not sufficient to outweigh my concerns. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR