



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 July 2020 by Darren Ellis MPlan

Decision by Kenneth Stone BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C4615/D/20/3246590

2 Brambleside, Wordsley, DY8 5XN

- 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 Arron Sutton against the decision of Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P19/1272, dated 5 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is first floor front, side and rear extensions and single storey rear extension, elevational changes including insulated render to existing external walls.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on Brambleside, adjacent to the junctions with Old Park Road and Old Barn Road. The majority of properties in the street are red brick semi-detached properties with gable roofs. The appeal property is one half of a pair of properties with flat roofs and on which part of the front elevation was originally set back substantially to create L-shaped dwellings, but which has subsequently been extended with a porch and garage. The proposal seeks to add a first-floor front, side and rear extension along with a single-storey rear extension, and to provide insulated render and cladding to the property.
 5. Whilst the appeal property has been previously extended the L-shape form remains at the first-floor level, and the pair of houses have been painted white. The property is located in a prominent and elevated position close to the junction with Old Park Road, and both the existing dwelling and the proposed first-floor extension would be highly visible to those entering Brambleside from Old Park Road.
-

6. The proposed two-storey side extension would be set slightly back from the adjacent front elevation and the roof would be set slightly below the existing roof height. However, the proposal would result in the loss of the L-shape appearance of the existing property. The existing porches on both of the semi-detached properties and the attached garage of the appeal property, along with the differences in the current fenestration of both dwellings, have slightly unbalanced the appearance of the pair of semi-detached properties although the character of the building has remained. However, the proposed first-floor extension would be a substantial increase to the massing of the property which would substantially unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties.
7. The first-floor extension would be finished with Monterey Taupe HardiePanel cladding to replicate the original buff colour of the stone blocks used to construct the building. However, the original stone blocks have previously been painted white and none of the original buff colour remains, and as such the Monterey Taupe colouring would appear out of keeping with the existing building.
8. As a result of the scale, design and materials, the proposed first-floor extension would not be a sympathetic addition to the property and would detract from the character and appearance of the appeal property. Furthermore, as the pair of properties are distinctive and prominent in the street scene, the proposal would also detract from the character and appearance of the street.
9. I acknowledge that there is a variety of materials used in the vicinity of the appeal site, including a modern housing development in Blackthorn Road. However, the appeal property and its adjoining neighbour are distinctive properties that do not match the character and appearance of the surrounding properties, and therefore the materials used at nearby properties does not justify the use of the same materials at the appeal property.
10. The appellant states that during the original planning application the Council requested for the proposed extension to be set back 2.25m from the front elevation. My attention has been drawn to the side extensions at Nos 1 and 11 Brambleside, which have been set back from the front elevations by considerably less than 2.25m. However, these extensions respect and maintain the character and appearance of the original dwellings, which differ from the character and appearance of the appeal property, and as such are not directly comparable to the appeal scheme. In any case I have considered this appeal on its own merits.
11. I therefore conclude that the two-storey front and side extensions would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the area, and would therefore be contrary to Policy ENV2 of the Black Country Core Strategy (February 2011) and policies S6 and L1 of the Dudley Borough Development Strategy (March 2017). These policies require development, including house extensions, to respect the context and character of the surrounding area and not to have a detrimental impact on the character, form and design of the host dwelling. The proposal is also contrary to the guidance set out in Planning Guidance Note No.17 – House Extension Design Guide (1998).

Other Matters

12. I understand the appellant's reasons for the proposed development, to provide additional living accommodation and as the property is in a poor condition and in need of refurbishment. However, this would not outweigh the harm identified above.
13. The Council raises no objection to the single storey rear extension. Based on my observations on site and the evidence before me I see no reason to disagree.

Overall conclusion

14. The proposed development does not accord with the development plan and there are no material considerations that indicate a decision otherwise would be appropriate. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Darren Ellis

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Kenneth Stone

INSPECTOR