The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 July 2019

by A Denby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/B3438/D/19/3231145
56 Moss Park Avenue, Werrington ST9 0EP

- 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 & Mrs Mark Tattum against the decision of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council.
- The application Ref SMD/2019/0045, dated 14 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 March 2019.
- The development proposed is described as '*roof space bedrooms and front porch*'.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Plans for a previous scheme have been submitted s part of the appeal. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the proposal on the basis of drawings ref: MPA/MT/2018/2; MPA/M1/2108/I & MPA/MT/2019/3/H.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The site is located on a prominent corner position within an established residential area. All elements of the proposed development will be visible from the public realm to some degree, though the rear extension, porch addition and dormer to the western roof slope due to their size, design and location on the property will not be disproportionate to the existing dwelling or overly prominent within the street scene.

5. Due to the single storey nature of the existing building, its proximity to the side boundary, boundary treatment and change in levels along Shirley Avenue rising up to Whitmore Avenue[1] the eastern roof slope is the predominant visible feature of the building from the public realm.

6. The dormer window proposed will be a substantial addition to this roof slope extending across both the original and extended sections of the dwelling. It

[1] Although I saw on my site visit a street sign showing Whitmore Avenue adjacent to the site boundary, the plans label the road parallel to the eastern side of the appeal site as Shirley Avenue. For the avoidance of doubt I have referred to the road name, as indicated on the submitted plans.

would be extremely prominent in the street scene and would become the overriding feature of the building.

7. I saw on site that many of the single storey properties in the surrounding area have dormer windows. They are generally on the principal or front elevations, contained within the original roof slope and with window size/design reflective of the main dwelling.

8. Whilst not on the principal or front elevation I do not consider that a dormer on the roof slope fronting Shirley Avenue would be wholly out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area.

9. However, the proposed dormer would extend beyond the confines of the original roof slope and be notably larger in length than others in the vicinity. The central protruding section leads to a contrived design which is exacerbated by the proposed window size / designs.

10. The dormer would dominate the existing property and would be a prominent and incongruous addition within the street scene adversely impacting on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

11. On this basis the proposal I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to Policy DC1 of the Staffordshire Moorlands Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2014, which seeks to ensure that developments are of a high quality, adding value to and respecting the site and its surroundings. It would also be contrary to Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks high-quality design and well-designed places.

12. The appellant has referred to an earlier approval for a dormer window at the site and to their permitted development (PD) rights as potential fall-backs. However, the dormer on the eastern side which has approval is smaller than that proposed here. I have considered the proposal on its own merits and do not find that any such fall-back positions provide justification for overcoming the harm I have identified here.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Denby

INSPECTOR