

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2017

by Ian McHugh Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 11 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C4615/D/17/3169557
49 Fallowfield Road, Halesowen, B63 1BZ

- 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 Anthony Jarvis against the decision of Dudley Metropolitan Council.
 - The application Ref P16/1766, dated 7 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is first floor bedroom extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and on the streetscene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two storey semi-detached dwelling, which is situated within a row of other semi-detached houses fronting Fallowfield Road. The dwelling has a distinctive appearance due to its 'cat slide' roof. I noted at my site visit that many of the properties along Fallowfield Road have retained this original roof design. However, I also observed that side extensions (similar to the appeal proposal) have been built onto some other properties.
 4. The proposal is to construct a first floor side extension, which would provide additional bedroom and bathroom space at the property. It would be built onto the existing side wall of the dwelling and would incorporate a hipped roof. The front wall of the extension would be in line with the front wall of the existing dwelling.
 5. In reaching my decision, I have given consideration to the increased accommodation that would be provided at the property and to the benefits that would entail for the applicant and his family. I also note that the Council has granted a Lawful Development Certificate for a side-facing dormer addition to the property, which would have an impact on the appearance of the dwelling.
-

6. In addition, the existence of other similar extensions along Fallowfield Road is a material consideration. In this regard, the Council has referred to the extension at number 51 Fallowfield Road, pointing out that the planning policy context has changed since that particular development was approved. Nevertheless, the fact remains that these other extensions do exist and they form part of the streetscene.
7. Notwithstanding the above, in my opinion, the original 'cat slide' roof is a distinctive characteristic of the appeal dwelling. I consider it to be an important feature that reflects the original concept and architectural style of the building. The proposal would result in the complete loss of this feature and, in my view, this would be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal property. Furthermore, it would also be harmful to the uniform appearance of the pair of semi-detached dwellings (of which the appeal property is a part) and to the streetscene, given that the adjoining dwelling has retained its original roof style.
8. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with Policies DD4 of the Dudley Unitary Development Plan and ENV2 of the Black Country Core Strategy. These policies seek (amongst other things) to ensure that residential extensions do not have an adverse effect on the character of an area; and that proposals generally preserve or enhance local character. In my opinion, these policies accord with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, which have similar requirements (paragraphs 17 and 58).
9. The Council contends that the front-facing bedroom window would be out of character with the existing fenestration on the dwelling. Whilst the proposed window would be narrower, it would be of a similar depth and generally in line with the existing first floor windows. Furthermore, varying widths of windows are not uncommon on the front elevations of dwellings. Accordingly, I do not find against the proposal on this matter.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, it is concluded that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR