
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2023

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/23/3329426

13 Norman Road, Ashton-Under-Lyne, Tameside OL6 8QG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Fiazana Farzand against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00375/FUL, dated 12 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 14 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is two dormers to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect on the character and appearance of the area; and the effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residents with regard to privacy.

Reasons

3. The proposal would result in an additional dormer window to each side of the existing rear dormer. Reference has been made to permitted development rights but as there has been no formal determination with regard to proposed lawfulness, I have considered the proposal on its merits.
 4. The additional dormers would result in the three dormers in the rear roof slope dominating the appearance of that elevation. Although there is a box style dormer to both the front and rear, these sit centrally within the large expanse of roof and whilst not positive features, they are relatively subservient in scale overall. The addition of these new structures would entirely change the form and character of the side and rear of this property. They would substantially increase the prominence of these roof features which in themselves are at odds with the original character of the house. Given the alignment of the property, they would only be fully visible from private views but the side facing cheeks and the form of the flat roofs would be evident from both Norman Road and Poplar Grove. Whilst the existing rear dormer cheeks are visible in these views, the new dormers would be much more prominent given their position so close to the edges of the roof. They would detract from the character and appearance of this property and the wider area.
-

5. The current rear dormer serves a small second floor room. The two larger rooms to each side are currently served by rooflights. The new dormers would undoubtedly allow for a greater range of views compared to the roof lights. Whilst the views would be similar to the views already available from the small central room, through the existing dormer window, the new dormers would offer multiple opportunities, from much larger rooms, for overlooking of the neighbouring gardens, particularly 24 Poplar Grove and 114 and 116 Broadoak Road.
6. Although there would be a significant distance between the new dormers and the rear boundaries of the Broadoak properties, the height and position of the northern most dormer in particular, despite the presence of the existing dormer and the windows at first floor, would significantly increase the perception of being overlooked for those residents. They would have a clear view back towards this array of large windows from their rear gardens and the backs or their houses. Although 24 Poplar Grove currently has a high hedge which helps to screen views of its rear garden, this array of windows, at such a short distance and at second storey height, would represent an unneighbourly and intrusive development that would further reduce their privacy and increase the perceived level of overlooking.
7. Despite the outlook from the existing dormer and the first floor windows, these additional dormers, particularly the northern of the two, would represent unneighbourly development that would result in greater harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring residents with regard to privacy.
8. Although the proposal would help to meet the accommodation needs of the occupiers, it would harm the amenities of neighbouring residents and harm the character and appearance of the area rather than complement or enhance the surroundings. It would on balance, fail to satisfy the design requirements of policy H10(a) of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan (2004); and it would conflict with the amenity requirements of H10(d). It would also be at odds with the more general design requirements of policy C1.
9. The Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (2010) provides guidance with regard to dormer windows. The rear array of dormers would not be subordinate to the original building; their design and size would not reflect the architectural style of the house or the surrounding neighbourhood; they would exceed the suggested proportion of roof area taken up; and they would not be set back a metre from the eaves or line up with the fenestration below. They would therefore be at odds with policies RED1 and RED6 of the guidance. They would also conflict with the design and amenity requirements of the *National Planning Policy Framework*.
10. The proposal would create more versatile, long-term living accommodation, which would significantly improve the quality of accommodation the property provides. It would also bring economic investment to the area. Whilst these are considerations that weigh in favour of allowing alterations to the property, they are not sufficient to outweigh my concerns. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton
INSPECTOR