

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2016

by H Baugh-Jones BA(Hons) DipLA MA CMLI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 8th November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/C4615/D/16/3159517

8 Ashville Drive, Halesowen B63 3SD

- 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 Mrs Kathleen Jackson against the decision of Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P16/1012, dated 13 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 5 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is single storey front, side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey front, side and rear extension at 8 Ashville Drive, Halesowen B63 3SD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P16/1012, dated 13 July 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Existing Ground Floor Plan Drawing No. 1589 - 01; Location Plan Drawing No. 1589 - 02; Block Plan and Proposed Elevations Drawing No. 1589 - 04.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural matter

2. I have taken the description of the development, given in the heading above, from the appeal form as it most accurately describes the proposal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and that of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling located within an established residential area. Dwellings are generally of similar appearance although a number have been added to by front and side extensions. At the side of the appeal property is a set of garage doors that give access to a covered area, which in turn leads to a brick-built detached garage with a small store at its
-

side. Both the garage and covered area have adjoining flat roofs and the overall impression is one of a continuous building that extends most of the way along the side of the dwelling and substantially into the rear garden. This is not dissimilar to the neighbouring property at No. 10 and I also observed that No. 6 has a side extension projecting beyond its main front elevation, which extends all the way to the rear garden boundary.

5. The appeal scheme would bring the amount of built form at the side of the dwelling forward of its current front elevation and also proposes the addition of a porch. The new front elements would be visually tied together by the use of a pitched roof. Behind this, there would be a combination of flat and pitched roof forms.
6. I accept that the form of the proposed roof would be somewhat unconventional. However, the spacing between dwellings prevents any significant views of the appeal property's side elevation in the majority of views along the street and the canopy projecting from the front elevation of No. 6 would further limit views of the proposed extension. The pitched roof on the front part of the extension would also serve to minimise any appreciable visual effects of the roof form behind it.
7. Taking the above into account, I do not consider that the overall size or appearance of the proposed extension would be such that there would be any unacceptable effects on the character and appearance of the host dwelling or on the surrounding area.
8. The proposal therefore accords with the overall design principles of saved Policy DD1 of the Dudley Borough Unitary Development Plan (2005) and with saved Policy DD4 that, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development would not adversely affect the character of the area. The proposal would also accord with the local distinctiveness and design requirements of Policies ENV2 and ENV3 of the Black Country Core Strategy (2011).
9. I have also had regard to the Council's Planning Guidance Note No. 17 that relates to house extensions. However, this is quite prescriptive and therefore somewhat at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework. Moreover, I have not been made aware of how it was consulted upon or its status. For these reasons, I give it limited weight.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal succeeds.

Hayden Baugh-Jones

Inspector