
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 August 2020

by R Cooper BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C4615/D/20/3252796

41 Dorset Road, Wollaston DY8 4SZ

- 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 & Mrs Millichip against the decision of Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P20/0346, dated 4 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is the amended design to refused application Ref P19/1652.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey front extension at 41 Dorset Road, Wollaston DY8 4SZ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P20/0346, dated 4 March 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans: 41DR 1108/001 and 41DR 1108/002 Revision A

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the development proposed in the above banner heading has been taken from the application form. However, the Council's decision notice and the appellants appeal form more accurately describe the proposal as a single storey front extension. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property 41 Dorset Road is located within an established residential area. The prevailing character of the street consists of two-storey semi-detached dwellings. No 41 sits within a run of dwellings set well back from the footway by the front gardens and driveways. They are similar in appearance,

- constructed from red brick and tiled pitched roofs, with canopies over the front doorways.
5. The proposed extension would be single storey in height, it would be shallow in depth, and would have a modest forward projection. Its roof would be designed so that it would be pitched away from the street, overall, it would appear subservient to the host dwelling. Whilst the extension would project forward of the buildings either side, a substantial set back between the property and the road would be maintained. For these reasons, the extension would not appear prominent within the street scene, and its scale and design would respect the context of the local area and integrate well within its surroundings.
 6. The officer's report refers to the loss of balance and symmetry between the pair of semi-detached properties. However, due to the topography, the adjoining semi at No 39 is elevated above the appeal property and has a higher roof line. This already results in an asymmetrical appearance between the two dwellings. In my view, due to the siting and subordinate appearance of the extension, it would not have an additional harmful unbalancing effect when viewed from the street.
 7. Whilst the Council considers that the extension to be out of context in the area, the appellants statement has directed me towards numerous examples for comparison within the vicinity of the site. Based on the evidence before me, supported by my observations during the site visit, front extensions of similar scale and design are not uncommon in the area.
 8. I note that it is proposed that the new facing brickwork and tiles would match those of the existing property. This would contribute to maintaining the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding area and could be secured by condition.
 9. Consequently, the development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It accords with Policy ENV3 of the Black Country Core Strategy (2011) and Policies L1 and S6 of the Dudley Borough Development Strategy (2017), and paragraph 127 of the Framework which collectively seek to ensure development is of an appropriate form, siting, scale and mass, that respects local context and character. It would also be consistent with the Council's Planning Guidance Note No 17 - House Extension Design Guide.

Other Matters

10. I have considered the neighbouring occupier's objections regarding overshadowing and loss of light. However, the Council have not raised concerns with these matters, and based on the evidence before me there is no good reason for me to conclude otherwise. This does not alter my findings on the main issue above.

Conditions

11. In addition to the statutory commencement condition, a condition is necessary to ensure that the development carried out in accordance with the approved plans, in the interests of certainty. A condition is also necessary to ensure that the materials match those of the existing dwelling, in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is allowed.

R Cooper

INSPECTOR