
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 August 2019

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/C4615/W/19/3227501

39 Longmoor Road, Halesowen B63 1AP

- 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 Ms Sharon Sutton against the decision of Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P19/0210, dated 8 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 10 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is a 1st floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The surrounding area is suburban in character and consists of a mixture of house types and sizes. The appeal property is one of many examples of a Mucklow designed dwelling, which comprise of pairs of semi-detached dwellings with catslide roofs to the side. It sits within a row of similar dwellings that are slightly elevated above Longmoor Road, with other Mucklow style dwellings being located on the opposite side of the road. The catslide roofs and proportions of the Mucklow style properties give the surrounding area a distinctive appearance and contribute to its character in a positive manner.
4. The development would result in the loss of the catslide roof and its replacement with a first-floor extension with a hipped roof. This would be at odds with the adjoining semi and with the dwellings immediately adjacent to the site on the same side of the road. As a result, it would disrupt both the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached dwellings and the pleasant appearance of the street scene in this location which is formed by the row of Mucklow style dwellings. I consider that this would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The appellant has drawn attention to similar developments that have taken place to similar dwellings within the surrounding area, and in particular opposite the site. Whilst these are noted, they are relatively few in number in the immediate area. Furthermore, they serve only to illustrate how the development would affect both the pair of semi-detached dwellings and the

street scene as a whole. Accordingly, their presence does not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

6. The appellant has also referred to the fact that the appeal dwelling is the last in the row of Mucklow style dwellings before more conventional two storey dwellings with hipped roofs are found. However, the dwelling still forms part of a continuous row of Mucklow style dwellings and contributes to the positive character and appearance that this row creates. Therefore, the design of the adjacent dwelling does not outweigh the harm to character and appearance that would arise from the development. I note that the appellant considers that the Council has been inconsistent in its decision making, however I am not bound by previous Council decisions and I have considered the appeal on the merits of the case before me.
7. I conclude that the development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of both the pair of semi-detached dwellings and the wider street scene. The development therefore conflicts with Policies ENV2 and ENV3 of the Black Country Core Strategy 2011, Policies L1, S6 and S8 of the Dudley Borough Development Strategy 2017 and the Council's Planning Guidance Note No.17 – House Extension Design Guide, all of which seek to safeguard character and appearance.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR