



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 April 2024

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T4210/D/24/3337734

44A Newcombe Road, Ramsbottom, Bury, BL09UT

- 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 and Mrs Walker against the decision of Bury Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 70154, dated 3 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 22 January 2024.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with front and rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. The appeal site comprises a three bedroomed detached house that has a boxy form and a contemporary appearance, located within a residential area that includes a variety of dwelling sizes and styles. It is set back in the street scene between a two storey semi-detached house and on the other side a two storey building that comprises a shop unit with living accommodation above.
3. The proposed development would extend the ridge height of the existing pitched roof with a loft conversion and dormers to provide an additional bedroom with en-suite bathroom. The bedroom would have two windows to the rear in a flat roof dormer that would extend across most of the rear roof slope. The Council has not raised any objection to the rear dormer which it says could be built as permitted development and would not be prominent in the street scene. From what I have seen, I have no reason to disagree and that part of the proposal would be acceptable.
4. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document 6 'Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties' requires that dormers facing a highway should not occupy a disproportionately large portion of the roof. In addition, they should be set in at least 0.5 metres from side/party walls and set back at least 1m behind the main wall. The roof of the dormer should be 0.5 metres or more below the main ridge line. Dormer windows should seek to line up vertically with existing windows and match their style and proportions.
5. The two proposed front dormers would sit only very slightly below the main ridge and would be set back only very slightly from the front eaves and set in only very slightly from the side of the roof. Their width and the placement of

windows would not relate well to the existing dwelling. As such, those dormers would appear disproportionate in size and scale to the dwelling which would appear 'top heavy'. Although the dwelling is set back by some 6.6m according to the appellant from the adjacent shop unit and dwelling in the street scene, it is located on a busy road with bus stops adjacent and opposite and can be clearly seen from the street.

6. I have noted the appellants' wish to increase the head height of the loft space and allow the staircase to work above the existing. They say that the dormer size has been designed to accommodate the stairs and if moved or made smaller it will not allow the stairs to work. However, given the size of the dormer to the rear I am not persuaded that there is no other means of achieving that and the additional accommodation provided by the front dormers would be a private benefit that would not outweigh the wider public harm that would be caused in this case.
7. I conclude then that by reason of the size, scale and windows of the front dormers, the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. This would be contrary to the Council's SPD referred to earlier and to development plan policy H2/3 in the Bury Unitary Development Plan (1997) which seeks to ensure that extensions and alterations consider the character of the property and the surrounding area.
8. It is not clear to me that the proposed rear dormer is clearly severable from the front dormer and I am therefore unable to issue a split decision.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, the proposal is contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector