



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2025

by **Andrew Dale BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 October 2025

Appeal Ref. APP/Y3425/D/25/3371667

79 Baswich Crest, Baswich, Stafford ST17 0HJ

- 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 Deborah Instone against the decision of Stafford Borough Council.
 - The application ref. is 25/40598/HOU.
 - The development proposed is: "Rear dormer extensions to the existing chalet bungalow. Revised scheme".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matters and background

2. The description of the proposed development in the banner heading above is taken from the application form.
3. I observed at my site visit that the 2 proposed dormer extensions would in fact be situated on the south-facing side roof slope. The large single dormer extension that has already been constructed on this roof slope was refused by the Council under ref. 24/39797/HOU. A subsequent appeal against that decision was dismissed in March 2025 under ref. APP/Y3425/D/25/3358416.
4. No. 79 was originally built as a bungalow with rooms in the roof space. The appellant now understands that the dwelling is affected by a planning condition removing permitted development rights for extensions and additional windows and dormer windows because of the compact spatial relationship between the appeal property and its neighbours, 2 Tavistock Avenue being the closest.
5. The appeal scheme would involve creating a gap towards the centre of the current dormer extension so as to create 2 separate dormers, removing all 3 of the existing windows and introducing roof lights instead and colouring the cladding material white or in any other colour as may be agreed with the local planning authority.

Main issues

6. The main issues in this appeal are the effects of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the locality and upon the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling at 2 Tavistock Avenue, with particular reference to the potential for any overbearing effects.
-

Reasons

7. I have been referred to the Council's Design Supplementary Planning Document 2018 (SPD). The SPD is not policy in itself but it carries weight as a material consideration in decision making. The SPD asserts that roof extensions will be expected to be well proportioned, and designed to be sympathetic to the roof of the original dwelling. It says that roof dormers should be sympathetic in scale to the existing roof plan, and should not over dominate the host roof or appear overly box-like, or result in the dwelling appearing top-heavy.
8. I saw that the current dormer extends across much of the width and height of the bungalow's roof plane. The appellant indicates that the reduced scheme the subject of the appeal would retain about 66% of that dormer. However, looking at the plans, I find that about 80% of it would be retained. The subject additions would present themselves as sizeable, insufficiently subservient and bulky, box-like accretions which would visually dominate the side elevation and overall roofscape and harm the simplicity of form of the original building. The detailing would exacerbate these unfortunate effects. In particular, whatever its final colouring, the smooth-faced cladding material contrasts with the original roof tiles, whilst the absence of any side windows in traditional locations would also be rather incongruous.
9. The end result would be visually undesirable and noticeable in the wider residential surroundings. The dormers would be a visible part of the appeal property's roofscape in views from various vantage points on Baswich Crest and Tavistock Avenue. From those public vantage points, I am in no doubt that the subject roof additions would appear visually intrusive because of their dominance and lack of sympathy with the existing building and would harm the character and appearance of the area. There are many dormer windows in the locality, but the ones I could see appeared to be more modest in size when compared to their respective host roof slopes than those that would come about under this appeal scheme.
10. I find on the first main issue that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the locality. The scheme would not reach the high design standards sought by Policy N1 Design of The Plan for Stafford Borough 2011-2031 (PSB). Furthermore, the scheme eschews the detailed design guidance set out in the SPD. Good design is a cornerstone of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and a key aspect of sustainable development. I consider that the rear dormer extensions would not achieve a well-designed place.
11. The dormers would face towards the back garden of 2 Tavistock Avenue. Even though they would be wholly within the footprint of the original building, their separation distance from the common boundary with that adjacent dwelling would be little more than about 6.3m. The combination of the bulk and vertical extent of the dormer extensions in a location so close to both the common boundary and the neighbouring property would have an unacceptably overbearing effect on the occupiers there, as experienced in their outlooks from their rear private amenity space and rear windows. Whilst the absence of side windows in the dormers would overcome the previous issues around overlooking, it would tend to exaggerate their solid vertical massing and rather looming presence in the outlook from 2 Tavistock Avenue. That the appeal property stands on higher ground would also exacerbate the overbearing effect of the dormer extensions.

12. I find on the second main issue that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling at 2 Tavistock Avenue, with particular reference to the potential for overbearing effects. As the design and layout of the scheme would not take sufficient account of the amenity of an adjacent residential area, there would be conflict with the amenity objectives expressed within PSB Policy N1 Design, the SPD and the Framework.

Other material considerations

13. I saw that the dormers would provide more generous and useable first floor accommodation. I have also taken account of the absence of objections from local residents. Whilst I give weight to these other considerations, I have come to the view that they are not sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have described.
14. The Council had no objections in relation to highways and parking and found no adverse impact on the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation. I see no reason to disagree on those matters. Still, my findings on the main issues are decisive to the outcome of the appeal. There is conflict with the development plan. The harm cannot be mitigated by the imposition of planning conditions and it is not outweighed by other material considerations.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should not succeed.

Andrew Dale

INSPECTOR