



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2024

by Elaine Benson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/C4615/D/24/3346905

56 Heath Farm Road, Norton, Stourbridge, West Midlands DY8 3BY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs J Chana against the decision of Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P24/0131.
 - The development proposed is single storey rear extension and loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The works described above have already been constructed following an earlier grant of planning permission. That permission indicates the use of hung red tiles for the external surfaces of the dormer window. In this appeal, consent is sought for the use of an alternative material on the dormer window.
3. Therefore, the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed use of lead/zinc cladding on the dormer window on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached house standing in an area comprising traditionally built housing of various forms and designs. The house comprises red brickwork and red roofing tiles with matching tile hanging around the front bay. The newly constructed rear extension also comprises red brick. They are the predominant building materials found in the local area which also includes examples of render detailing.
5. Lead or zinc cladding is a traditional material which has historically been used for dormers and mansard roofs. However, within the context of the appeal site the introduction of metal cladding would appear incongruous. It would be out of keeping with the character of the host dwelling, the pair of semi-detached houses and the wider surrounding area, as there are views of the side of the dormer from the public realm, as well as views from the gardens of neighbouring properties. Furthermore, the use of a material which would significantly contrast with the colour and texture of the roof would unacceptably highlight the presence of the dormer window without any design justification.

6. The lead cladding used on the cheeks of the small dormers on the rear roof of the adjacent 58 Heath Farm Road are of an insignificant scale when compared to the extent of cladding proposed at the appeal property. These dormers and the other examples of metal clad dormers cited, which are not within the immediate visual context of the appeal site, do not affect my conclusion that the proposal would harm the character of the host property and the locality.

Other matters

7. The process of consultation and adoption of the Council's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) are not matters before me in this appeal. Comments relating to the 'permitted development' criteria for dormer windows are not relevant to this appeal which seeks planning permission.

Conclusion

8. I conclude that the proposed use of a metal cladding material for the rear dormer would be unsympathetic and would detract from the appearance of the existing property. It would also appear unduly prominent and incongruous within its wider surroundings. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies L1 and S6 of the Dudley Borough Development Strategy, Policy ENV2 of the Black Country Core Strategy and the SPD which, in summary and of relevance to this appeal, require the use of materials which respond to the context and character of the surrounding area.
9. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR