



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2024

by **Andrew McCormack BSc (Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V0728/D/24/3343643

41 Sandringham Road, Redcar TS10 1ER

- 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 David Honeyman against the decision of Redcar & Cleveland Borough Council.
 - The application Ref R/2024/0044/FF, dated 18 January 2024, was refused by notice dated 4 April 2024.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion including rear and side dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal proposal relates to a two-storey, semi-detached dwelling that is situated at the end of a residential street comprising similar semi-detached properties. To the north is a railway with housing to the east and south. To the west is an open area of ground that forms part of the Redcar and Cleveland College. The property has a number of existing extensions including a single-storey rear extension, a large two-storey extension to the side with a car port at ground level which allows vehicle access to the rear garden and a detached garage building at the rear of the garden.
4. Policy SD4 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan 2018 (the Local Plan) allows development that is suitable in terms of its proportions, massing, height, size, scale, materials and detailed design features and would respect the character of the site and its surrounding area. In addition, it is noted that the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD) states that dormer windows can increase the size of rooms created in lofts. However, they should be carefully designed to fit into the overall design of the property and the character of the area. Materials should respect the existing materials used and alterations should not disrupt the existing roof form. This includes elements such as roof hips, eaves and ridges. Furthermore, the SPD advises that additions to a roof should be proportionate to the existing roof.
5. In my assessment, because of the appeal property's position at the western end of Sandringham Road, it is visible from several directions, particularly from the car park of the College to the southwest, the college playing fields to the west and the car park at Kirkleatham Street to the northwest. The property is also likely to be visible from trains using the railway

line to the north. As a result, the appeal property is in a visually prominent location and therefore the proposed loft conversion would also be in a visually prominent position.

6. From the submitted plans, and my observations, the proposed dormer would extend out to the rear and side of the dwelling and extend across to the existing two-storey side extension roof. The cumulative impact of this on the character and appearance of the host property would result in a disproportionate roofscape that would be far removed from, and out of keeping with, the adjacent property (43 Sandringham Road) in the semi-detached pair and the surrounding properties in terms of its bulk, size and appearance.
7. The proposed dormer would be positioned high in the roof slope of the host and the proposed flat roof of the dormer extension would be in line with the existing roof ridge height. As a result, it would be highly visible in the street scene and local area from vantage points at the locations I have identified. In addition, during my site visit, I noted whilst conducting my visit that the proposal would also be visible, in part at least, from a significant section of Sandringham Road when travelling along the south side pavement. This would be for a distance of around 50 metres between Nos.40 and 62 Sandringham Road. This view of the dormer extension would be possible due to the hipped roof slope of the neighbouring property (No.43) which would reveal the side of the flat roof dormer from the public highway. The visual impact of this would be significant as it would reveal the proposal as an incongruous and unusual feature in the built environment of the local area where the semi-detached, two storey properties have a similar style and appearance.
8. I have had due regard to the examples of dormer extensions provided to me by the appellant. However, I must consider this appeal proposal on its own merits and circumstances rather than solely based on precedent due to other similar examples elsewhere. Notwithstanding this, during my visit to the area I noted that from what I could see none of the semi-detached properties for the full extent of Sandringham Road, or indeed the nearby Buckingham Road, appear to have dormer roof extensions to the front or rear. It is in that context that I find the proposed development would appear as a highly incongruous feature in the local area. As I have set out, it would be highly visible in the wider area and would therefore be out of keeping with, and harmful to, the predominant character and appearance of nearby properties, the street scene and the wider surrounding area.
9. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal, due to its bulk, size and shape would be visually incongruous in the street scene and would therefore have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As a result, it would be contrary to the aims of parts (j) and (k) of Policy SD4 of the Local Plan, paragraph 2.24 of the Council's Residential Extensions and Alterations SPD and relevant sections of the National Planning Policy Framework regarding good design.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

A McCormack

Inspector