



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/17/3192055

26 Low Wood Road, Denton, Manchester M34 2PD

- 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 Mr B Wood against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00829/FUL, dated 22 September 2017, was refused by notice dated 24 November 2017.
 - The development proposed is dormer to front, rear and side.
-

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 Low Wood Road, which is a cul-de-sac located off Ashwood Avenue. The host dwelling is of brick construction with a tiled hipped roof. The proposal comprises a dormer extension on the front, side and rear roof slopes. It would wrap around the existing roof and have the appearance of a single structure, due to all elements being connected.
4. The semi-detached bungalows on the same side of the road as the host dwelling are similar in form and appearance and do not appear to have been significantly altered when viewed from Low Wood Road. In particular they have no dormer extensions that are clearly visible when viewed from the front. This forms a strong and positive characteristic in the street scene meaning I consider that the appeal site is located within a row of similar properties that have maintained a sense of rhythm and balance. The proposal through its size, design and location, with particular regard to the front and side facing roof slopes 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 host property would be readily visible in the street scene to the detriment of character and appearance of the surrounding area.

5. In his submissions the appellant has drawn my attention to a number of similar dormer extensions on Low Wood Road, as well as a variety of properties with dormers in the wider area. No additional details have been provided regarding these schemes and no documentation has been provided regarding the Council's analysis of the 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. Additionally, the examples on Low Wood Road are not in a location or sufficient in number to have a material effect on the character of the side of the road on which the appeal property is located. Therefore, little weight can be attributed to them in the determination of the appeal. I have considered this appeal proposal on its own merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.
6. For all of these reasons, I therefore conclude that the proposal 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. It would conflict too with RED6 of the 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 had regard to various other matters raised by the appellant, including his need to develop a family home, to remain and live in the area to help the children attend the same local school, and to increase the property value. However, on the evidence before me these are not reasons to grant permission in the face of the harm identified. I have also noted his comments about the way the Council handled the application but these do not go to 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