



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 January 2018

by **Alison Partington BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5th February 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/17/3187790
199 Stockport Road, Mossley OL5 0RF

- 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 Mark Clegg against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00617/FUL, dated 15 July 2017, was refused by notice dated 11 September 2017.
 - The development proposed is a lost conversion with rear dormer including increase in ridge height.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a mid-terraced house. The terrace of which it is a part are all similar houses apart from the two houses at each end of the terrace which are larger than the rest. The appeal property is situated adjacent to one of the taller properties. The surrounding area comprises mainly terraced housing, and whilst there are a few dormers evident, they are not a characteristic of the area.
4. Policy RED6 of the *Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (adopted March 2010)* (SPD) provides detailed guidance on roof extensions and dormers. This discourages flat roofed dormers and indicates that the size and design should reflect the architectural style of the house and area. They should also be set back from the eaves and should not take up more than two-thirds of the rear roof plane, and line up vertically with the fenestration below.
5. The proposed dormer, which would have a flat roof, would be located on the rear of the property. However, there are a number of dwellings located on the hillside to the rear of No 199, and the rear of the property is clearly visible from the road leading to these houses. The dormer would be set slightly up from the eaves of the property but otherwise would occupy the entire roof plane. In addition, its height requires the ridge height to be increased. As such the dormer would be a disproportionate size and scale, and would be an

- overly dominant feature on what is a modest terraced house. As a result it would be an unsympathetic addition to the property and would harm the character and appearance of the area.
6. In addition, the increase in the ridge height of the property needed to accommodate the proposal would be visible from the main road to the front of the dwelling. As the resulting height of the property would be out of keeping with the rest of the terrace, including the larger houses at either end, it would make the dwelling an incongruous feature in the terrace which would be detrimental to the visual appearance of the area.
 7. Consequently, I consider that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policy H10 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan (adopted November 2004) which requires developments to complement or enhance the character and appearance of the surrounding area, as well as the advice in the SPD.
 8. In support of the appeal, my attention was drawn to two properties at the other end of the terrace that have similar very large dormers. However, I observed that properties with dormers in the area are very much in the minority. I do not know the circumstances of these cases or the policies that applied at the time of their consideration, but the other dormers confirmed that inappropriate dormers are detrimental to the character and appearance of the host property and the area, and so do not set a precedent that should be followed. Thus they do not justify allowing a poorly designed scheme on this dwelling.
 9. I note the personal circumstances of the appellant and the desire in particular to provide additional bedroom space for his family whilst staying in the local community. However, I have not been provided with any substantive evidence to show that the appeal scheme represents the only way that suitable alternative accommodation in the area can be found. In any event, personal circumstances seldom outweigh more general planning considerations, and it is likely that the adverse effects of the development would remain long after the current personal circumstances cease to be material.
 10. For the reason set out above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Alison Partington

INSPECTOR