



## Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 20 April 2021

**by F Wilkinson, BSc (Hons), MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 27<sup>th</sup> April 2021**

---

### **Appeal Ref: APP/H0738/D/21/3270813**

### **72 Whitehouse Road, Billingham, TS22 5AS**

- 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 Ian Cooperthwaite against the decision of Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 20/2723/FUL, dated 8 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2021.
  - The development proposed is construction of a front elevation roof dormer.
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### **Main Issue**

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and the host dwelling.

### **Reasons**

3. Whitehouse Road comprises a mix of detached and semi-detached 2 storey dwellings and bungalows separated from the road by their front gardens, pavement and grassed areas interspersed with trees. The dwellings in proximity to the appeal property are mainly bungalows with a mix of pitched roofs and gables to the front elevations. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow with a pitched roof to its front elevation.
4. I noted when I visited the site that a number of the bungalows in proximity to the appeal property have provided additional accommodation in the roof space through the addition of rear dormers or windows in the end gable. Front roof dormers are not a feature of the properties on Whitehouse Road in proximity to the appeal property and are in a minority within the wider area.
5. Due to its scale and siting on the front of the property, the proposed roof dormer would be an incongruous and overly prominent feature within the roof of the host dwelling that would significantly detract from its appearance. The use of matching materials would not mitigate this.
6. The proposed front dormer would be visible from Whitehouse Road. It would also appear incongruous when viewed against the roofscape of the surrounding properties, including the neighbouring attached dwelling which has an unbroken roof. It would unbalance the overall appearance of the street scene, including the symmetry with the neighbouring attached property. This would significantly harm the distinctive and cohesive character of the street scene.

7. I therefore find that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area and the host dwelling.
8. For the above reasons, the proposed development would be contrary to Policies SD3 and SD8 of the Stockton-on-Tees Local Plan 2019 which require all extensions to be in keeping with the property and the street scene in terms of style, proportion and materials and new development to reinforce local distinctiveness, amongst other matters. It would also be contrary to paragraphs 127 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which require developments to be sympathetic to local character and to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area, amongst other matters.
9. The appellant has drawn attention to a number of properties in the wider area that have front dormers. I do not have background details of these existing cases and so I cannot be sure that their circumstances are the same or very similar to the proposed development for me to draw any direct comparison. Furthermore, these examples do not change my view that front roof dormers are not a key element of the character of the area in the vicinity of the appeal property. I therefore give these examples limited weight. This is not sufficient to outweigh the significant harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area and host dwelling by the proposed development and the resulting conflict with the development plan.

#### **Other Matters**

10. I note the lack of objection from Billingham Town Council. However, this does not outweigh the harm I have identified.

#### **Conclusion**

11. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and host dwelling and would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

*F Wilkinson*

INSPECTOR