

Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 05/08/14

gan **Richard E. Jenkins BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

Dyddiad: 28 Awst 2014

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 05/08/14

by **Richard E. Jenkins BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Date: 28 August 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/Z6950/A/14/2221111

Site address: 21 High Street, Penarth, CF64 1EZ

The Welsh Ministers have transferred the authority to decide this appeal to me as the appointed Inspector.

- 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 Alex Sharifi against the decision of The Vale of Glamorgan Council.
- The application Ref 2014/00322/FUL, dated 13 March 2014, was refused by notice dated 19 May 2014.
- The development proposed is to alter the dormer window size at the above property.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of development from the Council's Notice of Decision as it provides a more concise and accurate description of the development proposed.

Main Issue

3. This is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises a traditional mid terraced dwelling located at the northern end of High Street in Penarth. The property incorporates a modest gable fronted dormer window with pitched roof, typical of those located elsewhere along the terrace. The appeal proposal would replace the existing structure with a larger dormer that would incorporate three window panes to the front as well as glazing on its side elevation.
5. The replacement dormer would measure approximately 5 metres in width, have an overall height of some 2.15 metres and incorporate a lean to roof. As such, whilst the appellant considers that it would provide a modern an innovative solution, its substantial scale, siting and design would result in an incongruous form of development that would dominate the existing roof plane. Moreover, given that the appeal property is one of a number of dwellings within the same block to retain the

original pitched roof dormer, the proposal would represent a prominent and discordant feature in the street scene.

6. I have fully considered the presence of other dormers within the area, including those that incorporate larger box like proportions. However, whilst I have not been provided with full details of these schemes, I have been advised by the Council that they are largely unauthorised or pre-date current planning policy. Nevertheless, some of the examples of larger dormers within the area, including some of those referred to by the appellant, reinforce the concerns identified above and, notwithstanding this, I do not consider that the presence of such dormers has resulted in an absolute change to the character of the area, thereby justifying further visual harm.
7. I acknowledge that no objections have been submitted by neighbouring occupiers. I also note that the appellant considers the scheme to comply with Technical Advice Note 12: *Design* (TAN 12) by reason of its innovative design. However, I consider the adverse consequences of the scheme referred to above to amount to compelling reasons why planning permission should not be granted and, for this reason, I do not consider that such matters outweigh the harm outlined above.
8. Therefore, based on the foregoing analysis, I conclude that the proposed replacement dormer would, by virtue of its scale, siting and design, represent a prominent and visually intrusive form of development that would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would be contrary to the provisions of Policy ENV 27 of the Vale of Glamorgan adopted Unitary Development Plan (1996 – 2011) which, amongst other things, aims to ensure that development complements or enhances local character of buildings and minimises any detrimental impact on adjacent areas.
9. For these reasons, and having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard E. Jenkins

INSPECTOR