



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 4 March 2025 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 May 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/U4230/D/24/3357902

4 Wellington Street West, Salford M7 2FH

- 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 S Lewis against the decision of Salford City Council.
 - The application Ref is PA/2024/1522.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion with hip to gable extension and erection of a rear dormer.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/U4230/D/25/3360440

4 Wellington Street West, Salford M7 2FH

- 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 S Lewis against the decision of Salford City Council.
 - The application Ref is PA/2024/1387.
 - The development proposed is a hip to gable roof extension and erection of front and rear dormers.
-

Decisions

1. The appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a hip to gable roof extension and erection of front and rear dormers at 4 Wellington Street West, Salford M7 2FH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PA/2024/1387, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing number 003 Rev 2 Proposed Plans and Elevations.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling.

Appeal Procedure and Main Issue

3. The site visits were undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendations are set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeals. The main issue in regard to both is the effect of the proposal in each case on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendations

4. The appeal dwelling is a two storey end terraced property with a hipped roof. Wellington Street West is a terrace with an almost unbroken original roofscape with

proportionate and subservient additions in the main which contributes positively to a strong sense of uniformity in general form, appearance and originality.

5. The proposed dormer in appeal A would occupy the entirety of the width of the appeal building's roof slope and a large portion of its depth including part of the two-storey rear offshoot. The resultant development would be a large, boxy and dominant addition which would unacceptably erode the originality of the roof's shape and reduce the quality of the area's consistency. Although the dormer would use appropriate materials, it would not respond positively to the original architecture or roof form of the host building. The rear of the appeal property is clearly visible and a prominent feature when viewed from Arran Street and the rear alleyway between Wellington Street West and Manley Street. Thus, the proposed development would be very prominent, highlighting the above harm.
6. There is no dispute between the main parties regarding the acceptability of the proposed front rooflights, and I see no reason to disagree with this conclusion. For the reasons as set out however, the proposed dormer on appeal A would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would fail to comply with Policies D1, D2 and D8 of the Salford Local Plan: Development Management Policies and Designations 2023 (SLP) and the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) These seek, among other matters, for development to protect, enhance and respond to any positive character and distinctiveness of an area.
7. The Salford City Council Supplementary Planning Document House Extensions 2006 (SPD) outlines guidance on dormer windows. Those in regard to appeal B, and referred to in the reasons for refusal, would be set back from the eaves and down from the ridge of the main roof slope resulting in a significant proportion of the main and thus original roof shape still being legible. The dormers would be well proportioned, sit comfortably and appear as two clearly subservient additions. They would use appropriate materials and respond positively to the consistency of the architecture in the wider street scene. The window proportions and alignment would also sit squarely in design and size terms with the existing property. Number 28 Wellington Street West on the opposing end of the terrace possesses a modest pitched roof dormer to the front roof slope. The ones at the appeal building would be similar. This would ensure that any changes to the originality and consistency of the terrace's roof would be minimal and subservient.
8. Front dormers are not part of the overriding character of the area, and it is undoubtedly the case that, in regard to appeal B, they would change the appearance of the appeal property. I am not persuaded however that this equates to a harmful impact for the reasons I have set out. Such that, for appeal B, there would be compliance with Policies D1, D2 and D8 of the SLP and the Framework. As well as the guidance set out in the SPD. The aims of which I have set out above.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has outlined a timeline of variously submitted applications for similar proposals that have been refused however I have not been passed any further details of these cases or made aware of how any of said schemes have been amended or evolved. I am also cognisant of a number of other large scale dormers locally. These are the exception rather than the norm and I am unsure of their

planning status. Neither matters alter my conclusions on the main issues in regard to either appeal.

Conditions

10. For appeal B, and in addition to the standard implementation condition, I have set out a condition specifying the approved plan for enforcement purposes. Also, and in the interests of the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area, it is necessary to include a condition that the external materials of the dormer match the existing building.

Conclusion and Recommendations

11. For the reasons given above, I recommend appeal A is dismissed and appeal B allowed, subject to the conditions listed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report on both appeals and, for the reasons set out, appeal A is dismissed and appeal B allowed, and planning permission granted, subject to the conditions set out.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR