



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 January 2020 by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Susan Ashworth BA (Hons) BPL MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 27 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G4240/D/19/3238821

5 Fern Crescent, Stalybridge, SK15 2RE

- 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 Mrs Katrina Dryden against the decision of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00684/FUL, dated 29 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is the removal of rear conservatory, side garage extension, loft conversion with front and rear dormers and front canopy.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. This proposal seeks permission for a side extension, porch and front and rear dormers. From the submitted evidence it is clear that the Council's reason for refusal relates to the two front dormer extensions, as the other elements of the proposal have already been granted planning permission through a previous approval. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of No 5 Fern Crescent and the wider area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow, located within a suburban residential area. The character and appearance of the immediate locality is derived in part from the uniformity in the simple form of the semi-detached bungalow properties, the most common dwelling type along Fern Crescent. The appeal dwelling, along with neighbouring properties, is set at a raised level above the highway and as such it is highly visible in the street scene.

6. Tameside Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (March 2010) (the SPD) provides guidance for household extensions. Policy RED1 requires that proposals apply an architectural style that reflects the existing dwelling and should not result in the significant external remodelling of a dwelling. Policy RED6 sets out detailed principles for dormer extensions and in particular notes that dormers are not encouraged at property frontages although they may be considered where they will not detract from the character of the street/surrounding area. The SPD is a material consideration and I have taken its policies into account.
7. The proposed dormers would be set back from the eaves and would largely align with the windows below. It is noted that they would also be finished in materials to match the host dwelling. Nevertheless, due to their width, overall massing and lack of set-down from the ridge line, they would have a bulky appearance which would dominate the front elevation and fail to respect the original form and appearance of the dwelling.
8. Additionally, due to the raised positioning of the dwelling, the proposed dormers would be highly noticeable from within the public realm. They would appear at odds with the character of the roofscape in the locality, which is informed by the horizontal form of the bungalows and their simple, uncluttered roof slopes. Furthermore, the positioning of the dormers on the roof, coupled with the approved and erected side extension at the host dwelling, would create an obvious imbalance to the shared roofscape of No 5 and the attached bungalow at No 6. Therefore, this proposal would read as an incongruous addition in the wider street scene.
9. The appellant has drawn my attention to existing dormer extensions at a property on the corner of Fern Bank and Fern Crescent. I observed that the dormers have significantly altered the original appearance of the dwelling. Additionally, they appear out of context with the surrounding area which has a distinct lack of front dormer extensions. As such, it seems to me that these dormers are not necessarily a good example of development to follow and as such do not justify the appeal proposal.
10. It is suggested that examples of rear dormers in the locality form part of Fern Crescent's street scene. Whilst there are examples which are visible from the appeal site, I do not consider that they form part of the character of the immediate locality as they are clearly read as rear dormers and are set-back from and at a lower level to the highway. Accordingly, I afford this matter limited weight in support of the appeal.
11. Consequently, taking all the above into consideration, the proposed front dormers would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of No 5 Fern Crescent and the wider area. As such, this proposal is contrary to policies H10 and 1.3 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan 2004, which collectively seek to ensure, amongst other things, that developments are sensitive to and complement or enhance the character of the local area. The proposal would also conflict with the requirements of the SPD as set out above, and the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly chapter 12, which seeks to ensure developments are visually attractive and sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hannah Ellison

Appeals Planning Officer

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Susan Ashworth

INSPECTOR