



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2024

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4245/D/24/3346882

10 Yew Tree Drive, Sale M33 2EX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Daniel Brown against the decision of Trafford Council.
 - The application Ref is 112904/HHA/24.
 - The development proposed is dormer loft conversion, single storey rear extension and alterations to covered front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for dormer loft conversion, single storey rear extension and alterations to covered front porch at 10 Yew Tree Drive, Sale M33 3EX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 112904/HHA/24, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: S.001 (Site Location Plan); P.100/B (Proposed Site Plan); P.110/C (Proposed Ground and First Floor Plan); P.111/C (Proposed Loft and Roof Plan); and P.210/C (Proposed Front and Rear Elevations).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing dwelling, unless otherwise specified on the approved drawings.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed dormer extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. No.10 Yew Tree Drive (No.10) is a detached, two-storey dwelling situated on the western side of Yew Tree Drive, a residential cul-de-sac. The dwelling has a simple, pitched roof form with gable ends. To the rear, it is proposed to construct a dormer roof extension to accommodate a bedroom, shower room and office.

4. The guidance in the Council's *SPD4: A Guide for Designing House Extensions and Alterations (2012)* is that dormer windows should be proportionate to the scale of the property and reflect the style and architectural character of the original house.
5. The proposed dormer would have a width of around 7.7m, a depth of around 3.1m and has been designed with a shallow mono-pitched roof. Consistent with the SPD4 guidance, its scale is modest relative to the host dwelling and a good degree of space would be retained between the edges of the proposed dormer, the top and sides of the roof and its eaves. Rather than covering the majority of the original real roof plane, I am satisfied that the proposed dormer would appear a proportionate, well-designed addition.
6. The windows on the dormer would be smaller than, and would align with, the principal first floor windows on the rear elevation of No.10 and would be aluminium to reflect other proposed fenestration details. The face and cheeks of the dormer would further be finished in a vertical hung clay tile which would complement the clay tiled roof within which it sits. Although not entirely reflecting the architectural character of the original house (built in c.1960s), the proposed detailing and design of the dormer would nonetheless reflect the proposed contemporary styling of No.10.
7. Because the proposed dormer would be set well in from the edges of the original roof plane, and below the ridge, I observed that its cheeks would only be glimpsed from Yew Tree Drive, in views from the north-east. It would be less visible in the streetscene than the existing rear dormer extension to No.3 Yew Tree Drive, to which the appellant refers.
8. The rear elevation of No.10 is visible from Stonyford Road, a residential cul-de-sac to the north-west. However, I observed on my site visit that for most of the length of Stonyford Road the proposed dormer would be largely obscured by those dwellings on the north side of the cul-de-sac. It would be clearly visible from the head of Stonyford Road, but its sympathetic scale and siting means it would not appear overly-dominant, or incongruous, viewed alongside the flat roof dormer of the adjacent neighbour at No.8 Yew Tree Drive. Further, whilst I accept that it would be visible from the gardens of adjoining neighbours, for the same reasons, it would not appear excessively large, or a particularly dominant feature.
9. I therefore conclude on the main issue that the proposed rear dormer extension would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, or surrounding area. In addition to according with the SPD4 guidance, it would accord with Policy JP-P1 of the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document (2024) because it would respect the character and identity of the locality in terms of design, siting, size, scale and materials used. It would further be consistent with the principles of good design in Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Other Matters

10. The neighbours to the rear of the appeal property, at No.11 Stonyford Road (No.11), have raised concerns that the proposed rear dormer extension would overshadow a window on the side elevation (facing No.10) and there would be overlooking resulting in a loss of privacy. I note that the proposed dormer would be around 12.5m from the shared boundary of No.11, so conflicts with

the Council's SPD4 guidance that a separation distance of 13.5m should be retained between any dormer at second floor (or above) and any boundary adjacent to private garden areas. However, I observed on my site visit that whilst there are two first floor windows on the gable of No.11 (facing No.10), both have obscure glazing and there would not therefore be any direct overlooking.

11. Further, because of the separation distance combined with the height of the proposed dormer windows, there would be no material overlooking of those ground floor windows on the gable elevation of No.11, such that there would be a loss of privacy. Finally, the modest scale of the proposed dormer and its orientation (to the south-east) means it would not result in the overshadowing of No.11, or its garden.

Conditions

12. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council and the tests for conditions set out within the Framework. In addition to the standard timeframe for implementation of the planning permission, in the interests of certainty, I have attached a condition which requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings.
13. To ensure the external appearance of the development is acceptable, I have also attached a condition requiring the materials used in construction of the external surfaces to match those used in the existing dwelling, unless otherwise specified on the approved drawings.
14. The Council have suggested an additional condition which would require the study window on the west elevation of the proposed dormer and the first floor window on the existing north elevation be obscure glazed. For the reasons given above, the proposed dormer window would not result in overlooking or loss of privacy to No.11, such that obscuring the sole window to the study room would be necessary. Further, I note that the first floor window opening to the north is existing and a condition requiring a replacement window to be obscured is also not necessary. The additional condition suggested by the Council has therefore been omitted.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R. Jones

INSPECTOR