



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 September 2022

by A.Graham BA(hons) MAued IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C4615/D/22/3298930
18 Fairfield Road, Halesowen B63 4PT

- 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 Carl Bishop against the decision of Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P22/0205 dated 10 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 April 2022.
 - The application is for proposed loft conversion with dormer to front and rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the Council's decision notice and differs from that used on the Appellant's original application. In Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development is the same as that used by the Council and as such I have used this description accordingly which I feel accurately represents the scope of the proposals.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a double fronted, detached red brick bungalow dating to around the 1930's. Although the property is located within a largely suburban area consisting of a large mix of house types and styles it was clearly part of three almost identical house types that sit alongside each other. As a result there is some modest interest in the forms of these bungalows despite later changes to their appearance.
5. For the most part I saw on my site visit a notable absence of dormer windows to the fronts of properties nearby. Where they do occur however these are, for the most part, modest in design and proportion and I consider them to be largely recessive within the streetscene.

6. The proposal before me seeks to convert the existing loft space of the bungalow into habitable space where the added benefit of higher levels of roof insulation could be accommodated. This would not only allow added accommodation for the household but would also give the opportunity to better insulate the roof of the property. Although the bungalow has previously been extended to the rear, these changes would be supplementary to this and represent the first upward expansion of the property into its roof space.
7. The proposals therefore seek permission for a front and rear dormer of a similar pitched roof design albeit with the rear dormer being somewhat larger. It is common ground between the parties that the rear dormer extension would be acceptable and as such the main point of contention is the proposed front dormer extension and its effect upon the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area.
8. As mentioned above, there is a noticeable lack of such front dormers within the streetscene here and the front roof forms of most properties are still largely uncluttered through the absence of such additions.
9. In the case before me I consider that the proposed dormer extension to the front has attempted to reflect some of the design parameters offered by the existing row of bungalows, such as the timbered gables and face cladding. I am however unconvinced that this pitched roof design would be the correct solution for this scheme as it would result in an extension of extensive width and height. Moreover, the proposal would introduce a new element into the centre of the front roof slope and would, as a result, dominate the front elevation of the host property.
10. The impact of the proposed dormer would therefore be visually prominent and alter the character of the existing three bungalows to such an extent as to detrimentally change the character of the area that these properties contribute towards. As such a level of harm would be sustained through this detrimental change in character of open roof form to one with a large, dominating roof dormer.
11. Although I consider that there may be ways to extend the bungalow into the roof I consider the proposal before me would result in a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the area here and that the scheme would be contrary to Policy ENV2 of the Black Country Core Strategy (2011), Policies S6, S12 and L1 of the Dudley Borough Development Strategy (2017).

Conclusion

12. As a result of my findings above and taking in account all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

A Graham

INSPECTOR