

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 August 2017

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 22 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C4615/D/17/3177461
58 Shenstone Avenue, Norton DY8 3ET

- 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 Jamie Williams against the decision of Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P17/0473 was refused by notice dated 19 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of a first floor side extension above existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. While the appellant has described the proposal as in the above heading, the Council has referred to it as a 2-storey and a first floor side extension. From my inspection of the plans, the Council's description more closely reflects the development sought. I have assessed the proposal on that basis.

Main issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a mainly 2-storey semi-detached house that occupies a prominent corner plot along Shenstone Avenue within a predominantly residential area. The proposal is to introduce a first floor extension above the single storey utility room and garage at the side of No 58, which would also be slightly enlarged, with external materials to match those of the host building.
 5. The proposal would be set back from the front of the main house with a ridgeline noticeably below that of the host dwelling. A reasonable gap between the flank wall of the new extension and the highway would also be retained. In these respects, the proposal would broadly comply with the advice within the Council's Planning Guidance Note No 17, *House Extension Design Guide* (PGN).
 6. The PGN does, however, advise that 2-storey extensions to corner properties will be required to take into account the visual impact upon the side road and not be unduly prominent nor out of character in the street scene. In this case,
-

the proposal would be a sizeable addition. It would result in a significantly larger property with extended 2-storey front and rear elevations that would be largely evident from the road. With 2-storey built form extending across most of the plot and a more substantial flank wall close to the highway, the finished dwelling would appear overly large for the plot. This would draw the eye from various public vantage points along Shenstone Avenue.

7. The inclusion of a part gable, part hipped roof end would also contrast with the existing roof with its gable ends. This arrangement would be at odds with the guidance in the PGN, which states that an extension should relate to the design of the original building and match the roof shape and pitch. As the only obvious example of this type of roof in the local street scene to which No 58 belongs, the proposal would be visually obtrusive.
8. I saw that some properties in the local area had been altered and extended and that some buildings with hipped roofs addressed street corners including the examples to which the appellant has referred. However, none of the properties had extensions of a comparable scale, roof form or position to that proposed and so these cases do not weigh in support of the appellant's case.
9. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the local area. As such, it conflicts with Policies L1 and S6 of the Dudley Borough Development Strategy and the Council's PGN. These policies and guidance aim to ensure that new development is appropriate in design and form, and that it respects and is responsive to the context and character of the surrounding area.
10. Once complete, the proposal would provide extra accommodation for the appellant and his family and improve their living conditions. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) notes that pursuing sustainable development involves seeking improvements to the people's quality of life. This consideration weighs in favour of the appeal. However, the Framework also makes clear that sustainable development involves improvements to the built environment and that planning should seek to ensure that development adds to the overall qualities of an area. As the appeal scheme would not do so for the reasons given, the balance of national policy is tipped against the proposal because it would not be a sustainable form of development.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above and taking into account the absence of objections from others, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR