

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/17/3177426

1 Sherwood Drive, Quarry Bank DY5 1UW

- 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 Dale Woodall against the decision of Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P17/0512 was refused by notice dated 24 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a double storey extension to side of house.
-

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 local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a mainly 2-storey house that occupies a prominent corner plot at the junction of Sherwood Drive and Chancery Way within an estate style residential area. It has a gable end facing Sherwood Drive and a flank wall with the roof slope angling away from view as the appeal dwelling addresses Chancery Way. The proposal is to introduce a 2-storey side extension with external materials to match those of the existing dwelling.
 4. The new addition would result in a significantly larger property with extended 2-storey front and rear elevations and an enlargement of its footprint. The new front façade would extend across the full width of the plot. That a new ridgeline would be introduced to run roughly parallel to Sherwood Drive would visually accentuate the considerable width and scale of the finished building. Taken together with limited space between the front corner of the extended dwelling and the highway, I consider that the completed building would appear to be overly large for the plot. This would be particularly evident from both Sherwood Drive in front of the site and in oblique views from Chancery Way.
 5. A substantial gable wall would be erected close to the footway that runs along Chancery Way. This new wall would be considerable in scale and height. It would occupy an elevated position relative to the adjacent highway due to the notable difference in ground levels. By standing large and tall above the
-

boundary wall to Chancery Way, this new flank wall would have an unduly imposing presence in the local street scene to which No 1 belongs.

6. The inclusion of gable ends to both the proposed front and side elevations, both of which would be conspicuous features of the completed building, would also differ to the shape and style of the existing building. This contrast would be such that the intrinsic character of the host dwelling would be compromised. It would also set No 1 clearly apart from the design and general appearance of other properties nearby to the extent that the finished building would draw the eye from the adjacent highways.
7. The Council's Planning Guidance Note No 17, *House Extension Design Guide* (PGN) states that extensions should relate to the character and design of the original building and match the roof shape and pitch. It also notes 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. For the reasons given, the appeal scheme would not comply with this advice.
8. The appellant considers that the proposal is reasonably sized and that it compares with other nearby properties along Chancery Way. However, to reiterate, it is the uneasy relationship between the appeal scheme and the host building and its visual impact that would be materially harmful in this case. Having assessed the proposal on its own merits, as I am required to do, I find it to be an unsympathetic form of development for the reasons given.
9. On the main issue, I therefore 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. It is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which emphasises the importance of securing high quality design and notes that development should add to the overall qualities of an area.
10. I share the appellant's opinion that the new extension would have no significant effect on vehicle movements and note that the proposal would adhere to the 45-degree rule. There would be no material harm to the living conditions of others. Once complete, the proposal would also provide extra accommodation for the appellant and his family that would improve their living conditions. However, none of these considerations outweigh the significant harm that I have identified in the relation to the main issue.

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