



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2020 by Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu BSc MSc MIEMA CEnv AssocRTPI

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/D/19/3239828

21 Silton Grove, Stockton-On-Tees TS18 5AT

- 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 Catherine Prosser against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 19/0971/RET, dated 17 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 2 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is dormer window extension to rear and side roof pitch.
-

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.

Procedural Matters

3. Work on the rear dormer has commenced. However, the Council is of the opinion that owing to its siting, that limited views of it would be achieved. They are also of the opinion that the overall style is suitable to the host dwelling and thus that it is acceptable. I find no reason to disagree with this assessment.

Main Issue

4. In view of the above, the main issue is the effect of the proposed dormer window to the side roof pitch on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. No. 21 is a semi-detached two storey dwelling located on Silton Grove. The surrounding area is residential, and its distinctive character is derived from semi-detached two-storey properties with hipped roofs. These give an appearance of a uniform street scene.
6. The proposed side dormer window by virtue of its siting would appear as a prominent feature to the host dwelling and would be at odds with the character of the surrounding area. Though there is a front dormer window at no.10 Silton Grove which creates a prominent feature in the street scene, my observation on the site visit was that it appears historic. Nevertheless, side dormer windows are not a prominent feature within the surrounding area.

7. The proposal would introduce an incongruous feature to the host dwelling. No.21 is located in a prominent position on the curve of Silton Grove. In addition to this, Silton Grove drops down towards the site on approach from Laneside Road. Therefore, views from this part of the street scene would be more easily achieved and would thus further exacerbate the prominence of the dormer window on this street scene. This would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property as well as the street scene.
8. I find that by virtue of its design and siting, the proposed dormer window to the side would result in a poor form of development to the detriment of the character and appearance of the street scene and host dwelling. It would fail to make a positive contribution to the local area by creating a prominent feature that would be at odds with the surrounding visual amenities of this street. Consequently, it would be at odds with the aims and objectives of policies SD3 and SD8 of Stockton-on-Tess Borough Council Local Plan 2019 which seek amongst other things to ensure that extensions are in keeping with the host property and street scene in terms of style, proportion and materials, and new developments are sensitive to the defining characteristics of the local area. It would also be at odds with the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has stated that she is willing to accept that the side dormer is not granted planning permission. However, she has requested that the rear dormer be approved as the Council find this element of the proposal to be acceptable. As such, it has been considered whether a split decision, granting planning permission for the rear dormer only, could be issued.
10. Both revisions B and D of drawing no. 001 show that the side dormer would be above the staircase which would give access to the roof space. It is not clear that the development could be carried out, with appropriate stair access to the loft bedroom, without the side dormer. Thus, it is not appropriate to grant planning permission for the rear dormer in isolation. It remains open to the appellant to seek planning permission from the Council for a revised scheme which only includes the rear dormer.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and on that basis, I agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR