



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 2020

by Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/19/3242693

29 Aulton Road, Sutton Coldfield B75 5PX

- 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 Asha Jhall against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/07424/PA, dated 28 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is new dormer to front roof elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property (No 29) is a semi-detached house. It is similar in appearance to a number of dwellings on Aulton Road that all have a dormer window in the front roof slope and a single storey pitched roof element that projects towards the road. Like the other nearby semi-detached properties, No 29's front dormer window is positioned centrally on the roof, adjacent to the connected dwelling and away from the unattached side elevation. The uniformity in the appearance of the dwellings and pattern of dormer windows creates a distinctive and pleasing regularity in the street scene.
4. As all other nearby properties only have a single dormer, the proposed second dormer window on the front of No 29 would be unusual to the local context. Also, by being set above the front projection and close to the side of the roof, the proposal would be markedly different to the predominant centrally positioned front dormers. As such, the development would unbalance the symmetry seen in the appeal property and its attached neighbour as well as disrupt the uniform pattern of dormers along the road. The fact the proposal would be similar in design to the existing dormer would not override or address the incongruity of the proposal and the subsequent harm to local identity.
5. For these reasons, I conclude that the development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. Consequently, and in this regard, it would be contrary to policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan 2017, saved paragraphs 3.14C and 3.14D of the Birmingham Unitary Development Plan 2005, the Extending Your Home, Home

Extensions Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2007 and the National Planning Policy Framework. These all aim, amongst other things, to ensure that development responds positively to its surroundings and reinforces local identity.

6. The appellant has submitted no case for allowing the proposal contrary to development plan policies. Consequently, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathan Edwards

INSPECTOR