Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2025

by N Robinson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 October 2025

Section 78 Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/D/25/3368599

Development: Proposed side and rear extensions and rear dormer window at 34 Dunval Road, Bridgnorth, Shropshire WV16 4NB

Application Ref is 25/00766/FUL

Decision- The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

Issue – the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties

1.) 34 Dunval Road is a detached dwelling situated in a street scene comprising semi-detached and detached dwellings, some of which have been extended and altered. To the rear the dwelling backs on to rear gardens of properties on Greenfields Road. At my site visit I observed that the dwellings on Greenfields Road contain window openings facing the appeal site. The proposal seeks permission for side and rear extensions and the erection of a flat roof dormer window to the rear elevation which spans the width of the existing and extended roof slope and projects onto the rear extension. The dormer window incorporates 3 window openings. Alterations to the fenestration to the front and rear elevations are also proposed.

2.) There is no evidence before me that the extensions would result in a harmful loss of light to neighbouring properties, noting their siting and orientation within the plot relative to neighbouring properties. However, the proposal would result in the creation of new openings within the dormer window which would overlook neighbouring properties to the rear of the site and their private rear gardens.

3.) I have given consideration to the weight to be afforded to development which could be carried out under permitted development (PD) rights. I have limited information about whether there would be an intention to build a PD extension if this appeal were dismissed. However, there would seem a greater than just theoretical possibility that this would take place. The appellant indicates that a PD extension could incorporate side and rear extensions, a flat roof dormer window spanning the existing dwelling and alterations to the fenestration.

4.) However, there is no indication that a dormer window projecting beyond the eaves of the dwelling over an extension could be carried out under PD. Given this a dormer window carried out under PD would be located further from the rear site boundary than the appeal proposal, which would project over a rear extension. As the openings would be sited closer to the site boundary and the private gardens and

windows to the properties on Greenfields Road, overlooking resulting from the appeal proposal would be greater than that arising from a PD dormer extension. I thus afford this PD fallback position limited weight.

5.) The appellant references an application for the erection of extensions and loft conversion[1]. That dwelling bordered a public park and there is no indication that the site characteristics and relationship with neighbouring properties is comparable to the appeal site. I therefore afford this decision limited weight.

6.) The proposal would result in overlooking of the gardens and window openings to the properties on Greenfields Road, resulting in an unacceptable loss of privacy for the occupiers of these dwellings which would go beyond existing levels. The proposal would thus be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of these properties.

Issue – effect on the character and appearance of the area

7.) In street scene views the form, scale and massing of the extended property would appear consistent with dwellings in the surrounding area and would not appear excessive in scale in relation to the size of the plot. The altered fenestration to the front elevation would be proportionate to and consistent with the form of the host dwelling.

8.) To the rear elevation the proposal would incorporate a wide and deep flat roof dormer window which, in combination with the number and size of proposed and altered window openings, would comprise a discordant addition to the property, altering the dwelling's appearance to that of an uncharacteristic 3-storey boxy structure. However, given the limited street scene views of the rear elevation, this would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the wider area.

Other Matters

9.) I note that the proposal would result in improvements to the appellant's living conditions, improved environmental performance, economic benefits during construction and may result in increased council tax revenue. However, these modest benefits do not outweigh the harm identified. That dormer windows are found within the street scene does not overcome the harm to living conditions.

10.) Whilst it is noted that the proposal has been amended following the feedback in earlier applications, these amendments have failed to address the proposal's harmful impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

11.) I have found no harm in relation to the effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. However, the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties is determinative. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole, and nothing outweighs this.

N Robinson

INSPECTOR

[1] 21/05769/FUL