



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2022

by K Ford MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C4615/D/22/3302211
36 Granville Drive, Kingswinford DY6 8LH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr M Hill against the decision of Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P22/0448, dated 22 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with front dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - Is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.
 - The effect on the living conditions for the occupants of the dwelling with regards light and outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached bungalow with pitched roof in a residential area comprising a mix of similarly styled bungalows and semi-detached dwellings. There are no front dormers within the streetscene.
4. The introduction of 2 dormer windows would have an unbalancing effect on the symmetry No 36 Granville Drive shares with the neighbouring property. Although the dormers would be smaller than a box dormer and sit away from the eaves, they would nevertheless sit high on the roof, in line with the ridgeline and would therefore be a prominent addition. The absence of other dormers in the road would mean that the scheme would be an incongruous addition detrimental to the character and appearance of the area.
5. Reference has been made to examples of other dormers in the area, not all of which make a positive contribution to the streetscene, as acknowledged by the appellant. Their existence does not weigh in favour of the proposal. In any event, the dormers referenced are not located in the same road as the proposal and so the circumstances are different and therefore they do not set a

precedent. In addition, each case is determined on its own merits and my assessment has been based on the information before me.

6. The development would harm the character and appearance of the area and therefore conflict with Policies CPS4, ENV2 and ENV3 of the Black Country Core Strategy. Amongst other things, these policies require the design of building and spaces to be influenced by their context, protect local distinctiveness and be of high quality design. The development would also conflict with Policies L1, S6 and S8 of the Dudley Borough Development Strategy, the relevant part of which requires the design of new development to be of an appropriate form, siting and scale, be responsive to the character of the area and reinforce and enhance local distinctiveness.

Living Conditions

7. The proposed main bedroom within the roof space would contain no windows and therefore have no natural source of light or outlook. The appellant has indicated that daylight to the rear bedroom would be provided via a rear facing dormer constructed under permitted development. However, my assessment is based on the plans before me. As submitted, the development would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupants of the property. As such it would conflict with the part of Policy L1 of the Dudley Borough Development Strategy which requires an appropriate level of amenity to be provided for the future occupiers of development.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons identified, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Ford

INSPECTOR