

HOUSEHOLDER PLANNING APPEAL

PROPOSED SIDE AND REAR DORMERS

15 Guest Road, Manchester, M25 3DJ

(‘the Property’).

APPELLANTS'

STATEMENT OF CASE

- 1.0 This statement of case relates to Council's decision notice dated 13th May 2024 (application ref: 70600) and the purpose of the appeal is to respectfully dispute the reasons for refusal provided in said decision notice.
- 1.1 The application was determined as refused. The reasons for refusal were based upon the policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan: H2/3 – Alterations and Extensions, EN2/1 – Character of Conservation Areas and EN2/2 – Conservation Area Control and associated Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties.
- 1.2 We believe the decision was unjust and inconsistent in accordance with Article 35 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) England Order 2015 (as amended).

2.0 THE SITE

- 2.1 The appeal relates to a semi-detached two storey dwelling with basement and loft on Guest Road. The appeal property is located within Poppythorn Conservation Area ('the Conservation Area').
- 2.2 A site plan is attached at Document No. 1. Showing the Property edged in red.
- 2.3 For ease of reference please find attached the original application with plans and heritage statement (Document 2), the Decision Notice (Document 3) and the Delegated Report (Document 4).

3.0 THE PROPOSAL

- 3.1 Planning permission was sought for the erection of a side dormer, rear dormer and a single storey flat roof at the property. The formal description of the planning application submitted is 'Side dormer; Rear dormer; Single storey rear pitch roof to flat roof with parapet wall'
- 3.2 The proposed side dormer will be added to the existing loft with a pitched roof. All materials used will match those currently on site.
- 3.3 With regards to the rear dormer, all materials will match those currently on site, as stated on the proposed drawings.
- 3.4 The flat roof with parapet wall at the rear of the Property will match the existing brickwork currently on site.

- 3.5 The proposed side dormer is designed to facilitate sufficient head height above the stairs that is currently 1.5m in height.

4.0 **GROUND OF APPEAL**

- 4.1 Planning permission was refused based on the following reasons outlines in the Notice of Refusal of Planning Permission.

'The design of the appearance of the proposed dormers are neither appropriate to, nor sympathetic with the existing structure, and would therefore would (sic) have a seriously detrimental impact on the existing street scene. The proposed development therefore conflicts with the following policies of the Bury Unitary Development Plan: H2/3 – Alterations and Extensions, EN2/1 - Character of Conservation Areas and EN2/2 - Conservation Area Control and associated Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties'.

- 4.2. Further commentary is provided by the Council in the Officer's Delegated Report.

5.0. **SIDE DORMER**

- 5.1. Upon reviewing the Notice of Refusal of Planning Permission and the Officer's Delegated Report, the reasons for denying planning permission for the Side Dormer can be summarised as follows:

A. *'The design of the appearance of the proposed dormers are neither appropriate to, nor sympathetic with the existing structure, and would therefore would (sic) have a seriously detrimental impact on the existing street scene'*

B. *'The proposed side dormer to the existing hipped roof... would be visible in the street scene and from wider views to the rear in and out of the Conservation area and would represent a contemporising and incongruous feature in the conservation area which would not preserve or enhance its character or appearance'*

C. 'There appears to be just three properties along Guest Road which have pitched roof dormers to the front elevations, but those dormers are relatively small on the roof space and they are built with traditional features which reflect the buildings they are on. The side dormer would be fully visible in the public realm and its ridge would be built up to the

same height as the ridge on the existing dwelling. This would result in the building appearing incongruous on the pair of semis and in the wider streetscape...'

5.2. REASON A

The planning application submitted specified that the materials for the side dormer would not only match but also complement these already present on site. The proposal includes a sensitively designed and proportioned pitched roof that aligns with the existing pitched roof styles in the area. The design ensures that the dormer would not be a dominant or incongruous feature, preserving the character and appearance of the surrounding area and nearby dwellings. Additionally, the side dormer has been designed to be as small as possible to maintain the aesthetic harmony.

The Officer's Delegated Report stated that the proposed side dormer extension '*do not represent a feature of the conservation area as a whole or of the period dwellings that contribute to its character*'. However, as evidenced by the proposed elevations, the slate pitched roof of the side dormer will indeed enhance and contribute positively to the character of the Conservation area.

5.3. REASON B

The Officer's Delegated Report notes that the side dormer would be visible from the street scene. While this is true, the impact would be minimal. The side dormer would be visible from Guest Road approaching from the East, specifically from 40 yards out (near 19 Guest Road on the North side and 28 Guest Road on the South side). However, it would not be visible when approaching from the West and would only be noticeable from eye level if one looked up at the Property. Policy H2/3 – Extensions and Alterations would be mitigated as the visibility for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers of motor vehicles would be minimal.

Regarding the outlook (wider views) from the side dormer, it is mostly obstructed by 17 Guest Road and a large tree, making it visible only to three houses to the northeast of Guest Road. Please refer to the photographs marked 'Documents 5, 6 and 7,' which show the views from the proposed side dormer to the NNE, N and NEE, respectively. This evidence demonstrates that the impact on the outlook, both to and from the side dormer would be minimal.

5.4. REASON C

The council highlights that *‘There are just three properties along Guest Road which have pitched roof dormers to the front elevations’*. However, the side dormer under consideration is not situated at the front elevation but rather on the side. Properties on Guest Road exhibit a diversity of designs and sizes, including various rooflines. For example, number 5 and 7 Guest Road feature dormer roof on the rear. At Poppythorn Lane, numbers 63 and 65 have front dormer, whereas number 67 Poppythorn Lane, the adjacent property does not. This demonstrates that while the neighbourhood maintains consistent brickwork, stone features, and slate roofs, they vary significantly in size and design, with no uniform roofline along Guest Road or within the Conservation Area.

The delegated report states, *‘There are just three properties along Guest Road with pitched roof dormers on the front elevations, but these are relatively small in roof space and they are built with traditional features which reflect the building they are on.’* The planning application submitted affirms that the side dormer will similarly occupy a modest space on the roof and will incorporate traditional features consistent with the character of the building, thereby meeting these criteria.

Regarding the Officer’s comments that *‘The side dormer would be fully visible in the public realm and its ridge would be built up to the same height as the ridge on the existing dwelling,’* the proposal adheres to the guidance outlined in SPD6 – Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties (January 2020). Specifically, the side dormer will not extend beyond the original ridge line. Additionally, in accordance with guidance at EN/1, measures have been taken to ensure minimal visibility of the side dormer from the public realm.

6.0 REAR DORMER

6.1 Upon reviewing the Notice of Refusal of Planning Permission and the Officer’s Delegated Report, the reasons for denying planning permission for the Rear Dormer can be summarised as follows:

A. ***‘The proposed side dormer to the existing hipped roof and the box dormer to the rear roof slope would be visible in the street scene and from wider views to the rear in and out of the conservation area and would represent a contemporising and***

incongruous feature in the conservation area which would not preserve or enhance its character or appearance’.

B. *‘the attached dwelling at No 13 which is an NDHA would have harm caused to its setting by the proposed box dormer which in turn would represent a loss of significance’.*

6.2 REASON A

Contrary to the comments in the Delegated Report, the Rear Dormer would not be visible in the street scene. The impact from wider views within and outside the Conservation Area would be minimal for two reasons: (a) the rear dormer would only be visible to three houses at the rear (not located within the Conservation Area. Please refer to document 1, highlighted in yellow), and (b) the materials used would complement the existing structure.

Furthermore, Planning Permission has been granted previously for similar works in the Conservation Area.

1. 40 Poppythorn Lane, a property located within the Conservation Area, planning permission was granted for a loft conversion with rooflights at front and dormer at rear under planning reference 65618. Copy of drawings, the Decision Notice and Conservation Area Officer report are attached at ‘Document 8’. Conservation Officer Mark Kilby affirmed *‘The proposed dormer extension to the rear would not be in the street scene as such it would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area’*. While the works do not appear to have been carried out, planning permission was granted based on their minimal visibility from the street scene.

2. At 7 Glebelands Road, another property within the Conservation Area, planning permission was granted for a Rear Dormer Extension under reference 61276. These works were completed, as evidenced by the decision notice and planning drawings included in ‘Document 9’.

6.3 REASON B

The Officer’s Delegated Report discusses the impact on Number 13 which is a Non-Designated heritage asset (NDHA). According to the report, *‘The attached dwelling at*

No.13 which is an NDHA would have harm caused to its setting by the proposed box dormer which in turn would represent a loss of significance’.

Nos 13 and 15 are visibly distinct houses from the street scene. The delegated report confirms that the Property and No 13 are not identical, as they state *‘the application dwelling has an altered front elevation by way of two storey bay window added probably in the late Edwardian period. The attached No 13 only has a bay added at ground floor level...’*

The houses differ notably at the front where the impact is most significant as it is visible from the street. The rear dormer would have minimal impact on No 13, as it would not be visible from the street scene.

Moreover, there are precedents where planning permission has been granted for similar works in the Conservation Area which are close to heritage assets.

For example, at no. 2A Nursery Road, planning approval (reference 68613) was granted for a modern building with a balcony, situated next to a Non-Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA) AT 59 Poppythorn Lane, Lagos House.

Additionally, at 12 St Ann’s Road, M25 9QD (planning reference 62389), permission was approved for the erection of a new modern dwelling next door to NDHA’s 2-10 St Ann’s Road.

The construction of new dwellings as mentioned earlier would likely have a more significant impact on nearby Non-Designated Heritage Assets (NDHAs) compared to the erection of the rear dormer. It seems inconsistent that paragraphs 203, 208 and 209 of the NFFP would apply strictly to the proposed dormers and not to the construction of entirely new building in a Conservation Area adjacent to NDHAs. This stance contradicts the Officers comments that *‘the rear box dormer would represent a contemporising and incongruous feature in the conservation area which would not preserve or enhance its character or appearance. Similarly it would not be considered to be in keeping with the existing building for the same reasons’.*

7.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 7.1 We disagree with the assertion that the proposed dormer extensions would introduce an ‘incongruous’ element to the streetscape. Considerable thought was given to the scale and massing during the design phase.
- 7.2 The dormer extensions are designed to harmonize seamlessly with the existing architectural features, ensuring they are neither overly dominant nor visually obtrusive. Considerable attention was given to their proportions and placement to ensure they harmonize with the surrounding streetscape, thereby enhancing the character of the area.
- 7.3 There are several comparable extensions as reference within the Conservation Area that serve as precedents for our proposal.
- 7.4 Based on the reasons provided, we believe that the proposed dormer extensions align with and effectively adhere to the guidelines outlined in The National Planning Policy Framework, as well as policies SPD6, H2/3, EN2/1, EN2/2 DM1, and EN1.
- 7.5 The Council’s planning policy emphasizes the evaluation of each extension based on its unique characteristics. The focus of the Appellants in submitting this application was to ensure that the proposed works harmonize with the appearance of the Conservation Area. The dimensions of the dormers have been carefully chosen to be as minimal as necessary for their intended purpose, and the materials selected will maintain consistency with the existing appearance of the Property.
- 7.6 We respectfully request that the Inspector uphold the appeal.

JULY 2024

PLANNING APPEAL BY MR AND MRS GARDNER
SITE AT 15 GUEST ROAD, MANCHESTER, M25 3DJ

List of Documents

Document No. 1: Site Plan (Page 10)

Document No. 2: The Original Application with Plans and Heritage statement (Pages 11 – 26)

Document No. 3: Decision Notice (Pages 27-28)

Document No. 4: Delegated Report (Pages 29 – 33)

Document No. 5, 6 and 7: Pictures taken from proposed Side Dormer (Pages 34-36)

Document No. 8: Copy of drawings and the Decision Notice Planning Reference 65618. 40
Poppythorn Lane (Pages 37 – 40)

Document No. 9: Copy of drawings and Decision Notice Planning Reference 61276. 7
Glebelands Road (Pages 41 – 44)