



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2021

by Laura Cuthbert BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Wednesday 22 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/21/3285740

46 Copthall Road, Birmingham, B21 8JJ

- 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 Mitchell Palmer of AJM Architectural Services against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/06550/PA, dated 17 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion- roof design will change to a gable roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council's evidence describes the appeal scheme as "installation of dormer window to rear with hip to gable roof alterations and roof lights to front". This more accurately identifies the proposed development and I have had regard to it in my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal building is one half of a pair of semi detached two storey dwellings spanned by a hipped roof. The traditional symmetry of building pairs in the street scene, as a result of consistent design and roof form, contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The alteration of one half of the roof to a gable end would noticeably unbalance the symmetry of the pair to the detriment of their presentation to the street scene. In addition, the large scale of the proposed dormer and its resulting visual dominance of the rear roof plane would make the building appear top heavy and further differentiate it from its adjoined neighbour.
6. The appeal scheme would therefore cause harm to the existing building and subsequently the character and appearance of the area. It would thus conflict with Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan (2017) and saved paragraphs 3.14 C-D of the Birmingham Unitary Development Plan (2005) which seek to ensure that design responds to the character of the local area. It would also be contrary to the advice in the 'Extending Your Home'

Supplementary Planning Document (2007) regarding dormer windows, which states that dormers must not be so big that they dominate the roof.

7. The proposed development would also be contrary to the principles within Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 which seek good design sympathetic to the local area.
8. My attention has been drawn to other similar roof extensions in the area. However, these are in the minority and the circumstances of each proposal are likely to be different. In any event, the fact that similar roof extensions exist in the area is not a reason, on its own, to allow unacceptable development in the above context. I have considered this appeal on its own merits and concluded that it would cause harm for the reasons set out above.

Conclusion

9. The development conflicts with the development plan. There are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Laura Cuthbert

INSPECTOR