



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 March 2018

by W Johnson BA (Hons) DipTP DipUDR MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 April 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/18/3195689

15 Broadfield Close, Denton M34 6BN

- 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 Ms J Reay against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00824/FUL, dated 27 September 2017, was refused by notice dated 21 November 2017.
 - The development proposed is front dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow sited on Broadfield Close, which is a cul-de-sac. The dwellings on Broadfield Close consist of semi-detached houses on one side with semi-detached bungalows on the other side and around the turning head. The host dwelling is one of the properties located at the head of the cul-de-sac and is predominantly of brick construction. The property has a tile roof with a gable end with a flat roof dormer on the rear, which is not clearly visible when at the front of the property. The proposal comprises 2 pitched roof dormers on the front facing roof slope.
4. None of the properties on Broadfield Close have any front dormer extensions. As a result, the relatively plain, uniform roofslopes form a strong and positive characteristic in the street scene. I consider the proposed dormers through their size, design and location on the front facing roof slope would result in an incongruous addition that would dominate the roof, fundamentally altering its shape and unbalancing its form and relationship with the adjoining dwelling. The resulting significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property would be readily visible in the street scene to the detriment of character and appearance of the surrounding area.
5. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of properties in the vicinity of the site with dormers. No additional details have been provided regarding these schemes and no documentation has been provided regarding the

Council's analysis of these schemes in relation to the effect on the character and appearance of the dwellings and surrounding area. Without this detailed information a comparison between these schemes and the case before me cannot be drawn and therefore little weight can be attributed to them in the determination of the appeal. In any event their presence does not have an appreciable bearing on the character or appearance of the context in which the site is viewed.

6. For all of these reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposed front dormer would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the existing bungalow and the surrounding area. This would be contrary to Policy H10 of The Tameside Unitary Development Plan that seeks high quality design in layout, design and external appearance of housing developments that in turn complement the character and appearance of the surrounding area and RED6 of the Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document that amongst other things seeks to ensure that dormers do not detract from the character of the street /surrounding area and complement the existing roof slope. As a result, the proposal would also be contrary to paragraph 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which amongst other things seeks to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.

Other matters

7. I have also had regard to various other matters raised by the appellant, including her need to develop a family home, but on the evidence before me this is not a reason to grant permission in the face of the harm identified. She has also expressed concern about the way that the Council handled the application, but this does not affect the planning merits of the case.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Wayne Johnson

INSPECTOR