



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2024

by Martin Allen BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D0121/D/24/3354323

40 Miles Close, Pill, North Somerset, BS20 0LH

- 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 Mark Peate against the decision of North Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/P/1445/FUH.
 - The development proposed is described as “Loft Conversion. Raised ridge and two rear apex dormers.”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located within a residential area that comprises a mix of detached, semi-detached, and terraced properties. This contributes to a sense of variety within the streets, which is reinforced by the differing detailed designs and use of materials within the built development.
4. The scheme details the construction of two large dormer windows to the rear roof elevation. These would extend almost to the same height as the ridge of the roof, as well as being positioned close to the roof eaves. They would be wide dormer additions and extend across a significant extent of the roof plane. As a result, they would be overly large and assertive additions to the roof, that dominate the rear elevation of the dwelling. There are clear views of the rear roof from public vantage points in the area and within these views the dormers would appear as incongruous features, harmfully at odds with the form of the existing dwelling.
5. The appellant contends that the design of the dormers follows the guidance as set out in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Design Guide. However, this sets out that “Dormer extensions should be designed so that their size and design is proportionate with the roof of the existing building.” I have found above that the size of the dormers is not appropriate in this instance and thus there is conflict with this guidance.
6. The conversion of the loft would also necessitate raising the ridge level of the roof by approximately one metre. Contrary to the Council's contention, this would not result in the dwelling towering over the neighbouring property. I observed that

differing roof heights was one of the defining features of the area, and in some cases, there was a distinct change in height between neighbouring, and indeed adjoining, properties. As such, the increase in height of the appeal property would not appear at odds with the scale of nearby buildings, given the context of the surrounding development. Nor would the increase in the plane of the roof result in any overly large, or top-heavy appearance to the dwelling, particularly given its already generous proportions.

7. While the raising of the roof itself would not result in any harm, the inclusion of the dormers would be harmful. The scheme is therefore contrary to policy CS12 of the North Somerset Council - Core Strategy (adopted January 2017) and policies DM32 and DM38 of the North Somerset Council – Development Management Policies (Sites and Policies Plan Part 1) (adopted July 2016), insofar as they seek to ensure that development is of a high-quality design, and that alterations to existing buildings respect the scale of the existing property.

Other Matters

8. The appellant states that loft conversions are common, with the majority having dormer extensions. While this may be true, it is the specific harm of this scheme that I have found unacceptable.
9. I note that the development would improve the accommodation within the dwelling for the occupiers. However, any benefit in this respect does not outweigh the harm I have identified.
10. My attention is drawn to a previously approved certificate of lawfulness application that is cited by the appellant. However, that was not an application for planning permission as with the appeal that is before me and so it does not lead me to find any differently than I have above.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin Allen

INSPECTOR