



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 October 2017

by Gareth Wildgoose BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13 October 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V4630/D/17/3181865

8 Burton Farm Road, Walsall WS4 2HN

- 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 Alison Oakley against the decision of Walsall Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/0506, dated 9 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 5 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is a second storey side extension over garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within the Burton Farm Road cul-de-sac which consists of detached properties with a range of architectural styles, including bungalows and two storey dwellings. There are, however, distinctive groups of dwellings that are of a similar character and appearance. No 8 consists of a two storey detached dwelling with a front gable design and a single storey side garage and porch. The property is similar in scale, form and proportions to Nos 4 and 6 with distinctive side separation between each property at first floor level, despite some differences in slab level, fenestration and the roof design of single storey elements. No 2, although comprising different materials, is also of a similar character but has a side extension above its garage.
4. The proposal would extend above the garage and porch that adjoins the side boundary with No 6. The extension would have a catslide roof at the front with a ridge level that would be higher than the eaves of the main roof of the property but lower than its ridge. The extension would also include a front dormer to provide roofspace accommodation.
5. The proportions of the side extension would not be subordinate to the host property, as notwithstanding its reduced ridge height, it would almost double the width of the property at first floor level. The design of the catslide roof would reduce the perception of terracing with No 6 despite the close proximity to the shared boundary and it could be finished in materials to match the existing dwelling. Nonetheless, the overall width and scale of the extension

together with the depth and angle of the catslide roof and inclusion of a front dormer would be viewed as an incompatible and incongruous addition to the front gable design and proportions of the host dwelling. The resultant loss of space at first floor between Nos. 6 and 8 would also disrupt the distinctive rhythm of the group of properties with a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

6. I have taken into account that first floor side separation distances are more limited in relation to the two storey dwellings with an alternative side gable design in Burton Farm Road, including the proximity of No 10 to the appeal site boundary. However, the different character and appearance of Nos 10 onwards in terms of main building lines, height, scale, form, proportions and architectural style ensures that they are visually distinct from the rhythm of the group of properties up to No 8. As such, the varied character of properties in the wider street scene does not justify the harm identified.
7. There are no properties directly opposite to No 8 and landscaping screens the rear elevations and gardens of the nearest properties to that aspect. Nevertheless, the harmful effect of the extension upon the street scene would be visible from public vantage points along Burton Farm Road. The possibility of future residential development at the rear of No 8 does not justify the harm. Furthermore, the existing first floor side extension at No 2 does not replicate the circumstances of the proposal or the harm identified, as it is of an alternative design and in a different location adjoining the rear garden and associated landscaping of a neighbouring property.
8. A number of examples of other existing extensions in the local area have been drawn to my attention. There is a similar extension at No 6 Rushall Close. However, it is not visible from Burton Farm Road and the circumstances which led to that extension being accepted were based upon different development plan policies which applied at the time. Furthermore, its presence serves only to confirm that such extensions are discordant additions which reduce first floor gaps and change the nature of relationships between properties to the detriment of the character of the area. First floor extensions of a different character in Mellish Drive and Stencills Drive which also impact upon the spaces between properties are not reason to allow the proposal before me.
9. I conclude that the development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. The proposal would, therefore, conflict with Policies CSP4, ENV2 and ENV3 of the Black Country Core Strategy, adopted February 2011, and Saved Policies GP2 and ENV32 of the Walsall Unitary Development Plan, adopted March 2005, and the associated guidance within the Designing Walsall Supplementary Planning Document, adopted July 2013. When taken together the policies seek high quality design, including regard for local character and distinctiveness. The policies are consistent with the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and taking all other matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gareth Wildgoose

INSPECTOR