
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 June 2020

by M Shrigley BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/G4620/D/20/3252694

3 Sunningdale Drive, Tividale, Oldbury B69 1PX

- 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 Smith against the decision of Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/20/63902, dated 16 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is a rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The host dwelling is situated in a row of four dormer bungalows, all similar in appearance. Other house designs are evident elsewhere along the road and in the wider vicinity.
4. The development would introduce a two-storey gable projection spanning the entire rear elevation of the appeal property. Its overall width some 7.5 metres and depth approximately 3.6 metres. Owing to the height, width and depth of the extension it would be visible as an overly dominant addition filling most of the existing roof plane. Its dimensions would not respect the uniform dormer roof design and modest building proportions evident within the row. Contrary to the appellant's argument that the extension would have a limited visual impact the effect would be significant and noticeable from public vantages toward the rear of the dormer bungalows along Hoylake Drive, as well as from surrounding neighbouring gardens. I acknowledge external building materials matching the host property are proposed but that would not overcome my concerns arising from the incompatibility of the bulk and mass of the proposal with its immediate surroundings.
5. I therefore conclude that the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy ENV3 of the Black Country Core Strategy (2011) which encourages high quality design, Policy EOS 9 of the Council's Site Allocations and Delivery Plan Document (2012) which supports the rejection of poor design that is out of scale or incompatible with a locality as well as the Revised Residential Design Guide Supplementary

Planning Document (2014) which requires extensions to be in keeping, and in proportion, with their surroundings. I disagree with appellant's view that the proposal accords with those requirements for the reasons explained above.

Other Matters

6. I note that the development is required to meet accommodation needs. However, such personal circumstances do not outweigh the visual harm identified.

Conclusion

7. For the above reasons I dismiss the appeal.

M Shrigley

INSPECTOR