



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2024

**by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 25.01.2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/23/3331060**

**61 Highfield Road, Washwood Heath, Birmingham, B8 3QE**

- 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 S Uddin against the decision of Birmingham City Council
  - The application Ref 2023/04913/PA, dated 4 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 12 September 2023.
  - The development proposed is apex dormer to front.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

### Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a 2 storey terraced house. The area comprises a mix of terraced and semi-detached houses with a variety of house designs. The appeal property, along with most houses within the terrace, has a slightly recessed front door with an arched surround, and decorative eaves. It also has a ground floor bay window which is a more common feature on terraced housing of a similar age on the opposite side of the road. There are no front dormers within the terrace with the only roof alterations comprising rooflights.
4. The Birmingham Design Guide (2022) (BDG) advises that the design of roof extensions must take account of the impact on the wider area, particularly roofscapes, and that dormer extensions must not dominate the roof. The proposed pitched roofed dormer would extend across most of the width of the house and its ridge would be at the same height as the main roof ridge. Consequently, it would dominate the roof of the host property and would appear out of keeping with the relatively unaltered roofscape across the remainder of the terrace.
5. The appellant has referred to there being similar dormers on houses elsewhere within the street. I note that some houses further along from the appeal site, towards Hart Road, have steep pitched roof dormers above 2 storey projecting bays. However, these are an original design feature common to all the houses within that section of terraced housing. They contribute to their uniform character and appearance and provide a rhythm specific to the terrace's roofscape, which is unrelated to the roofscape of the terrace of which the appeal

site is part. They are not therefore comparable to the proposal which would be a dominant and isolated feature at odds with the design of adjoining houses and others within the same group. The proposed development would therefore conflict with Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan (2017), Policy DM2 of the Development Management in Birmingham Development Plan Document (2021), the BDG and the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) which require high quality design that reinforces local distinctiveness and complements the character of the host building and its surroundings.

### **Conclusion**

6. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*P D Sedgwick*

INSPECTOR