



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 June 2020

by David Carter BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C4615/D/20/3244927
92 Garland Crescent, Halesowen B62 9NH

- 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 M Jeanneret against the decision of Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P19/1266, dated 4 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of development above is taken from the planning application form albeit that I have omitted elements that are not an act of development.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property (No 92) is a detached dwelling occupying a prominent corner position at the junction of Garland Crescent with Summerfields Avenue. The dwellings are traditional in-style comprising a mix of detached and semi-detached properties featuring hipped roofs. No 92 has a modest single storey extension and conservatory to the rear, both of which would be replaced by the wrap-around appeal proposal to both the side and rear. Many other properties nearby have been extended at the side and/or rear, mainly single storey with some double storey although the appeal proposal is designed to a different configuration. The front and side main walls of the existing property align with the main building lines of nearby properties on Garland Crescent and Summerfields Avenue respectively.
5. In relation to the effects of the design of the proposed extension on the host property, the dimensions would result in the footprint approximately doubling compared to the original building. In addition, the width of the side extension (at 4.5m, according to the appellant's dimensions) would be significantly more than half of the original building. As a consequence of these dimensions, the

- rake of the proposed hipped roof to the extension would be significantly less steep compared to the existing main roof.
6. Having compared the proposal with other extensions nearby, it is not uncommon for the top of the hipped roofs of extensions to reach up to sills of the first storey windows. This would be the case in relation to the rear extension but to the side, the roof would be higher and require remodelling of the landing window. The need for this extra height to the side extension would appear excessive and would be a further consequence of the dimensions and design of the proposal.
 7. The visual effect of the proposed extension would, therefore, appear as a dominant, incongruous and excessive addition by virtue of both its footprint and roof height. These would be in harmful contrast with the design, scale and mass of the original building, or be sufficiently sympathetic to the prevailing design characteristics common to nearby properties on the estate.
 8. The prominent corner position of the appeal property would exacerbate these harmful effects. It has been suggested that the screening of the proposed extension from the boundary fence and existing vegetation to the Summerfields Avenue boundary would considerably soften and reduce its impact. However, the width of the proposed extension to the side would leave a relatively narrow strip of land so it is likely that the existing belt of vegetation would be significantly affected, thereby reducing its ability to mitigate the visual impact of the development. The height of the side extension would be visible above the fencing to the side.
 9. The appellant has drawn my attention to a recent extension at 69 Summerfields Avenue which has planning permission (Ref P19/0629) and is under construction. This includes a 2 storey side extension of a similar width. I have viewed this property and note the circumstances are materially different because of; the orientation of the property, the proposed extension being for a side extension alone and, that the 2 storey extension is designed so as to appear subservient and in-keeping with the key design features of the original building, in particular the pitch of the roof.
 10. The proposed single storey extension to the side and rear of No 92 would harm the character and appearance of both the host building and the surrounding area. This harm would arise from the scale, mass and resultant visual prominence of the proposed extension. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy ENV 2 of the Black Country Core Strategy (2011) and Policies L1 and S6 of the Dudley Borough Development Strategy (2017) as well as the provisions of the Council's Planning Guidance Note 17, House Extension Design Guide.
 11. Collectively the development plan policies emphasise the importance of protecting and enhancing local distinctiveness without having a detrimental impact on the character of the host building or surrounding area. The Design Guide requires that extensions should match the existing roof shape and pitch and, be in scale and balance with the whole of the original building.

Other Matters

12. The Council considered the potential impact on the level of natural light and outlook on the occupiers of the neighbouring property (No 90) arising from the

projection of the proposed rear extension (3.4m according to the plans) noting this would exceed the guidance in the Council's 45 Degree Code. However, since permitted development would enable an extension up to 4m in depth the Council considered the projection of the proposed rear element to be acceptable. I have no reason to demur from this conclusion but the absence of harm in this respect does not mitigate the harm to the character and appearance of the area I have identified above.

13. I acknowledge that the appellant has attempted to address the Council's concerns over an earlier proposal (Ref P19/0789) but I have considered the appeal on its own merits.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

David Carter

INSPECTOR