
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2017

by M Aqbal BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 2nd August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C4615/D/17/3174283

21 Hadcroft Grange, Stourbridge DY9 7EP

- 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 and Mrs Kabir Ahmed against the decision of Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P16/1656, dated 18 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is ground and first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the development as set out in the application form differs from the development as shown on the submitted drawing, which is referenced: Dwg 1641-02. This drawing includes a single storey rear extension and a boundary fence. At the time of my visit I noted that a boundary fence is already in place.
3. I have therefore determined this appeal on the basis of the submitted drawing.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed side extension on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. 21 Hadcroft Grange (No 21) is a two storey semi-detached dwelling occupying a prominent corner position within a cul-de-sac, which forms part of a suburban 1960's housing estate. There are a number of house designs throughout the estate, which give it a varied appearance. The layout of the dwellings is more uniform and in general dwellings are parallel to the highway with strong and established building lines set behind open front and side gardens. This layout gives the streetscene a degree of uniformity and rhythm, which establishes a well-defined and consistent character for the wider estate. The open verges and frontages give the estate a spacious and open appearance.
6. The side elevation of No 21, adjacent to the highway also conforms to an established building line. The proposed two storey side extension would project

out from the established building line by approximately 3m. As a consequence of its depth, which includes a single storey element, width and height the proposed extension would be an obvious and discordant feature within the streetscene. This would distort the established building line in a prominent location and disrupt the established rhythm of the layout. Notwithstanding the existing fence because of its siting and mass the side extension would also erode the spacious and open appearance of the site and wider area.

7. I accept that by following the form and fenestration of the original dwelling, providing a set-back at first floor level and lowering the ridge height the appellant has taken on board advice set out in Planning Guidance Note No 17, published by the Council, and has designed the extension to be subservient to No 21. However, whilst the design respects the character and appearance of the dwelling; overall, it would conflict with the character and appearance of the wider area.
8. I conclude that due to its siting and mass the proposed extension would have a materially harmful impact on the character and appearance of the streetscene and would be in direct conflict with Saved Policy DD4 of the Dudley Borough Unitary Development Plan, October 2005, which amongst other matters only supports extensions to dwellings, which have no adverse effect on the character of an area.
9. The appellant has also referred me to other extensions to dwellings in the vicinity of the appeal site. The first is a modest single storey extension, which is not comparable to the proposal. I have not been provided any details of the existing two storey side extension. In any event, each proposal is considered on its individual merits. Therefore, the presence of other extensions in the vicinity of the appeal site does not affect my decision.
10. For the reasons set out above, I dismiss this appeal.

M Aqbal

INSPECTOR