The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 December 2016

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V4630/D/16/3160628
167 Broadway North, Walsall WS1 2QB

- 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 Kamaljit Chaukria against the decision of Walsall Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application Ref 15/0945/FULL was refused by notice dated 21 July 2016.
- The development proposed is described as a loft conversion.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

3. The proposal is to alter and extend the roof of the appeal property, which is a 2-storey semi-detached dwelling, to facilitate the conversion of the roof space to provide additional living accommodation. The appeal dwelling forms part of a row of individually designed houses that face the same side of Broadway North. Beyond the rear of the site is open land, which the Council refers to as the Arboretum Extension and playing fields.

4. The roof of No 167 would be elongated over the existing first floor extension and include a part gable, part hipped end. The materials would match the existing dwelling and the removal of the flat roof, beyond a front gable would improve the appearance of the house. However, the proposed extension would significantly add to the scale and mass of the dwelling at a high level with a considerable expanse of front roof slope evident from Broadway North.

5. From this highway, the front roof of the finished building would appear overly large for the host building even with a part hipped feature at the end. The long continuous ridgeline facing the road would visually accentuate its considerable scale and bulk. Even though No 167 is set back from the road, the proposal would draw the eye because the completed building would appear ill proportioned. The additional built form would also further unbalance the pair to which No 167 belongs because its attached counterpart still retains a hipped roof. For these reasons, the finished building would be obtrusive in the local

street scene, even among the varied built form within it, to the detriment of the area's visual character.

6. At the rear, three new dormer extensions would be placed onto the extended roof slope. Each of these new additions would be small, which would avoid significantly adding to the bulk of the rear roof. However, their modest size would relate poorly to the more substantive built form of the main dwelling. Taken together, these new dormers would form a row across the roof slope, which would be highly conspicuous and repetitive features of the appeal building, markedly contrasting with its simple design and unfussy rear roofscape. That the new dormers would be unevenly spaced apart and neither align with nor successfully relate to the windows below would also conflict unsatisfactorily with the pattern of fenestration in the rear façade.

7. The awkward relationship between the new dormers and the host building would be visible from the rear gardens of the properties on each side of No 167 and from the open land beyond the back of the site. In reaching this conclusion, I have taken into account the effect of planting especially beyond the site that would partially screen and visually soften the new development to some extent.

8. Paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that planning permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area. For the reasons given, that would be the case with the proposal before me.

9. Reference is made to 151 The Crescent where the appellant states that planning permission has recently been granted for substantial new build to the rear of that property. Few details of this scheme have been provided and so I am unable to conclude that the circumstances in that case are directly comparable with the proposal before me. In any event, each development should be assessed on its own merits, as I have done in this instance.

10. On the main issue, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would materially harm the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. As such, it is contrary to Policies CSP4, ENV2 and ENV3 of the Black Country Core Strategy and Policies GP2 and ENV32 of the Walsall Unitary Development Plan. These policies aim to ensure that new development promotes or enhances local character, achieves a high quality design and positively contributes to the quality of the environment. These policies underpin the advice within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document for Urban Design, *Designing Walsall*, with which the proposal would also conflict.

11. The additional accommodation would improve the living conditions of the occupiers of No 167. However, this consideration does not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR