



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 December 2024

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/T4210/D/24/3347547
15 Guest Road, Prestwich, Bury, M25 3DJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Ben Gardener against the decision of Bury Council.
 - The application Ref is 70600.
 - The development proposed is a side loft dormer. Rear loft dormer. Single storey rear pitch roof to flat roof with parapet wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Poppythorn Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a two storey semi-detached dwelling situated in a residential area, characterised by the presence of detached and semi-detached dwellings.
 4. Most dwellings are two stories in height and there are a number of dwellings with original dormers, providing rooms at roof level. During my site visit, I observed there to be a number of roof lights, indicating the presence of attic or loft rooms.
 5. The appeal property is situated within the Poppythorn Conservation Area which is characterised by streets comprising late 19th Century and early 20th Century period dwellings. The presence of period features, including tall gables, single and double gable windows, ornate brickwork and tall and prominent chimneys is complemented by the common use of red brick and slate, together with decorative stone lintels and dressings.
 6. The setting back of dwellings behind low stone walls and front garden areas provides for an appreciation of their features and affords them a sense of presence and grandness. This set back, along with gaps between dwellings and pairs of dwellings, also provides for clear views of the sides and roofs of dwellings.
-

7. The traditional form of the roofscape around the appeal dwelling comprises an attractive feature of the area. Pitched and hipped roofs generally appear in their original form and make a significant contribution to and add to the cohesiveness of, the character and appearance of Poppythorn Conservation Area.
8. The proposed additions to the appeal dwelling's roof would be unlike any other withing this part of the Poppythorn Conservation Area. Together, they would introduce modern, boxy additions, the appearance of which would jar with that of the original form of the roof of the appeal dwelling, as well as with the roofs of its neighbours. Consequently, the proposed dormers would appear as awkward, alien features.
9. The harm arising from the above would be exacerbated as a result of the prominent position of the proposed side dormer, clearly visible within its surroundings, and the side of the proposed rear dormer, such that the proposed additions would draw undue attention to their incongruous appearance.
10. Consequently, the proposed development would comprise an unsympathetic addition that would detract from the identified qualities of the Poppythorn Conservation Area.
11. Given this, the proposal would detract from and would not conserve the appearance of the Poppythorn Conservation Area. Having regard to paragraph 208 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and to Planning Practice Guidance, I consider that the harm to the character and appearance of the Poppythorn Conservation Area would be less than substantial.
12. This needs to be balanced against any public benefits the development may bring and this regard, there is nothing before me that comprises or amounts to a public benefit that outweighs the harm identified.
13. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the Poppythorn Conservation Area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, to Policies H2 and EN2 of the Bury Unitary Development Plan (1997) and to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document 6: Alterations and Extensions to Residential Properties (2020), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

14. In support of his case, the appellant refers to other developments elsewhere. However, there is nothing before me to demonstrate that the circumstances relating to these are so similar to those of the proposal before me as to provide for direct comparison. Notwithstanding this and in any case, the proposal would result in harm and this is not something that is mitigated by the presence of other developments elsewhere

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR