



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2022

by Elaine Benson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C4615/D/21/3279583

22 Camden Way, Kingswinford DY6 7SE

- 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 A Wenlock against the decision of Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P21/0758, dated 12 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension and front porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for two storey side extension and front porch at 22 Camden Way, Kingswinford DY6 7SE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P21/0758, dated 12 April 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: DRG No 02/A, DRG No 04/A and location plan.
 - 3) 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.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property (No 22) is a semi-detached house in a cul-de-sac of similar properties. The first floor of the proposed extension would be flush with the front wall of the house and the roof ridge height would match that of the existing. In such circumstances the Council's Planning Guidance Note 17 (PGN17) requires a first floor set back and the roof to be set down from the existing ridge height in order to maintain subservience, to preserve the symmetry of the semi-detached pair and to prevent a terracing effect.
4. However, PGN17 also states that a set back will be required unless 'there is a stagger in the building line'. In this appeal, the building line between Nos 22 and 23 is staggered significantly. In these circumstances there would not be a resulting terracing effect and in my judgement the proposed extension would not appear dominant. Whilst the extension would unbalance the symmetry of

the semi-detached pair, this would not be to the detriment of the street scene due to the varied building lines and would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

5. The alterations to the ground floor front elevation would be modest and in keeping with similar canopies and porches in the street scene. I agree with the Council that they are acceptable.
6. For the reasons set out, the scale and design of the proposed development, would comply with Dudley Borough Development Strategy (2017) Policy L1 - Housing Development, extensions and alterations to existing dwellings and Policy S6 - Urban Design. There would be no conflict with PGN17 or Black Country Core Strategy (2011) Policy ENV2 - Historic Character and Local Distinctiveness. The proposal would be consistent with the design policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conditions

7. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning I have identified the approved plans in a condition. A further condition is necessary which requires the use of matching materials in order to safeguard the appearance of the area.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above the appeal should be allowed.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR