



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2025

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C1055/D/25/3374790

10 Dovedale Rise, Derby, DE22 2RE

- 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 Steve Workman against the decision of Derby City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01340/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a side dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is detached bungalow. It is located in a residential area characterised by the presence of detached bungalows and two storey dwellings in garden plots.
4. The appeal dwelling is positioned such that its gable end faces Dovedale Rise and as such, it forms one of a row of similarly positioned dwellings. The roof of the dwelling is a little higher than those of other bungalows, having been raised further to a previous planning permission¹, but it retains a similar pitch and simple appearance. Like most of its close neighbours, the appeal dwelling is set back from the road behind a grass verge, pavement and a front garden and it has a driveway leading along the side of the house to a detached single-storey garage.
5. The presence of grass verges, street trees and areas of public open space combine with that of front gardens and gaps between detached dwellings to provide for an attractive green and spacious local character.
6. Also, during my site visit, I observed that similarities in the design, materials, scale and siting of the row of bungalows within which the appeal dwelling is located provides for a strong sense of rhythm and uniformity, making for a very positive contribution to the character of the area. Notably, no dormers exist to break the uniform appearance of the simple pitched roofs of the bungalows.

¹ Reference: 02/09/00138.

7. I also noted during my site visit that the topography of the area is such that Dovedale Rise rises to the north-east, resulting in the appeal dwelling's south-west facing roof slope being widely visible in its surroundings.
8. The proposal would comprise a pitched-roof dormer window to the side of the dwelling. In so doing, I find that it would severely interrupt what is currently a coherent pattern of development, to which generally unaltered and simple rooflines make a strong, positive contribution.
9. Consequently, the proposed dormer would protrude from the host dwelling's roof slope in an intrusive manner, uncharacteristic of its surroundings. This would lead the proposal to detract from the area's distinctive sense of uniformity. The harm arising from this would be exacerbated as a result of the proposal's prominence and incongruity, leading it to draw undue attention to itself.
10. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to saved Policies H16 and GD5 of the City of Derby Local Plan Review (2006); and to Policies CP3 and CP4 of the Derby City Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2017), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

11. In support of his case, the applicant refers to permitted development rights allowing the building of dormers on other properties. However, the proposal before me was the subject of a planning application for development and there is no suggestion that it benefits from permitted development rights. The fact that different permitted development rights exist for different properties is not something which, in itself, supports the proposal the subject of this appeal.
12. In the above regard I note that that the proposed development would result in harm and this is not something that is altered by the presence of other developments elsewhere.
13. Also, in support of the proposal, the appellant draws my attention to what he considers to be the small size of the proposed development. However, the overall dimensions of the proposed development would not be so small as to be unsubstantial and as above, the proposal would comprise a development that would appear so intrusive in its surroundings as to result in significant harm to local character.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR