



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2024

by K Williams MTCP (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V0728/D/24/3350505

10 Borough Road, Redcar TS10 2EF

- 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 Paul and Joanne Hides against the decision of Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is R/2024/0199/FF.
 - The development is described as 'proposed dormer to the front elevation.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposal involves alterations to the roof of 10 Borough Road, the submitted drawings show a hip to gable extension, rear dormer and two front dormers. These had not been constructed at the time of my site visit. The appellant maintains that the creation of the gable in place of the hipped roof and rear dormer window are permitted development. It is not within my remit to determine whether these would be permitted development and there is no Certificate of Lawfulness of Proposed Use or Development (CLOPUD) under s192 Town and Country Planning Act 1990 before me.
3. However, I have considered the above matter insofar as it is relevant to the appeal. As the roof alterations had not been constructed and are required to facilitate the front dormer windows, I have considered the proposal on the same basis as the Council and included them in my decision. However, I have used the description on the application form, as there is no evidence an amended description was agreed.

Main Issues

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises the property situated on the corner of Borough Road and Conway Road. This corner left hand side hipped roof semi-detached property is located in a residential area, whose character is predominantly comprised of properties of similar architectural appearance. Together with the roadside verges and street trees this create a pleasant orderly layout. The consistent layout and appearance of the homes and mainly unaltered front, side and rear roof forms are

a positive visual attribute of the area. The appeal property is highly visible within the area from several directions, and therefore makes a positive contribution to this character.

6. The proposals would see two dormer windows on the front roof slope. These would be of traditional design; however they would appear as prominent and awkward additions within the modest roof slope. The traditional roofscape afforded by the hipped roofs are locally distinctive and largely intact. Other buildings nearby do not have altered front roof slopes.
7. The appeal proposal would create a gable end which would accommodate the front dormer windows. This change in the roof form would remove a characteristic feature of the area and would diminish the contribution of the generally consistent roofscape.
8. The rear dormer window would project across the original roof, and the proposed hip to gable extension and would almost span its full combined width. Although the overall height of the host building would be unaffected, the extensive large flat roofed rear dormer, with large window would result in it eroding the original roof, which would not reflect the existing character of the building.
9. Individually and in combination the proposal would be widely seen in the area. They would appear as dominant and incongruous features. The additional bulk, combined with the front and rear dormer windows would also unbalance the appearance of the two sides of the semi-detached building. Thus significant harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the area which would be widely seen.
10. I observed 35 and 36 Conway Road. These are some distance from the appeal site and located at a tangent to the streets. In my view their impact is lessened by this arrangement. It also results in the dormer windows being less prominent within the street than the proposal before me. I did observe other rear dormer windows on properties facing Borough Road, however this was smaller.
11. I have very limited evidence regarding the other examples provided. In my view those at 33 Oak Road, 22 Newmarket Road and Redcar Lane with front dormers have a differing architectural style, are not a corner property or have the combination of hip to gable, front and rear dormers. However, their existence does not, in my view, justify further harm to the street scene that I consider would arise from the appeal proposal.
12. Whilst the appellant claims the hip to gable extension and the rear dormer window could be constructed under permitted development, I do not have sufficient evidence before me to be certain. Even if they were, I am of the view that the front dormer windows would also be harmful as a stand-alone features, but also in combination with other roof alterations. I do not consider that the parts of the proposal which are claimed to be permitted development would be clearly and easily defined with reference to the submitted drawings. As such I do not consider that a split decision would be appropriate in this case even if there were elements that were permitted development.
13. The appellants would benefit from the proposals, which would allow them to remain in this accessible and sustainable location with their extended family. However, I only have limited information in this regard. It is not clear if a similar

amount of space could be achieved through other less harmful additions the property. Whilst I have sympathy with this situation, ultimately this is a private matter of limited weight and I have found in the wider public interest.

14. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy SD4 of the Redcar and Cleveland Local Plan, adopted May 2018. This which requires development in general to meet design principles to ensure that it respects or enhances the character of the site and its surroundings. It would also conflict with the aims of the Residential Extensions and Alterations Supplementary Planning Document which seeks to ensure dormer windows reflect the architectural character of the existing building.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, the proposal is contrary to the development plan. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Williams

INSPECTOR