



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 March 2022 by A Coombes

Decision by O S Woodward BA(Hons.) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/G4620/D/21/3292056

21 Lily Street, West Bromwich, Sandwell B71 1ED

- 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 S Singh & Mrs J Kaur against the decision of Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref DC/21/66026, dated 17 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 8 October 2021.
 - The development is the retention of a forward extension.
-

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. This appeal relates to a resubmission of application Ref DC/21/65227.
4. The application was submitted retrospectively, and the appeal has therefore been considered on this basis. I observed on site that the submitted drawings accurately reflect what has been built. Whilst the agent has suggested that the design of the development can be amended, no such alternatives are before me, and the appeal has been considered on the basis of the plans provided.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace of which it is a part, and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site is a two-storey dwelling situated within an established row of terraced properties that all have bay windows. The surrounding area is residential with a mixture of terraced and semi-detached dwellings. The bay windows along this terrace are uniform in size and siting. Although different style properties can be found on Lily Street there is a consistent character across the terrace of dwellings. The bay windows are attractive features which add articulation to the front elevation of the terrace and which, due to their relatively small size and chamfered side elevations, are subservient to their

host dwellings. Across the rest of the terrace, the entrance doors are flush with the principal elevations and the dwellings do not have porches.

7. The proposal seeks permission for a single-storey forward extension that extends the full width of the property with right-angled side elevations, and also incorporating an extended porch. It has been constructed in brick with uPVC windows.
8. By extending across the entire frontage of the dwelling, the extension disrupts the pattern of development along the terrace. Whilst it does not encroach beyond the site boundary on to the pavement, the increased scale and bulk of the forward extension is overly dominant towards both the host dwelling and the terrace as a whole. It is out of keeping with the character of the other dwellings in the terrace and disrupts the architectural integrity of the terrace within which it sits.
9. Although some materials used for the development match those used on neighbouring properties, this does not mitigate the visual harm caused by the scale and profile of the extension. A condition requiring minor design changes could not make the extension acceptable, because the visual harm caused by the extension primarily relates to its overall footprint and scale.
10. The appellant has provided examples of similar forward extensions on properties in Sandwell, and some further afield. Although some of these, specifically those on Law Street, are near to the appeal site, they are not seen within the same context. Many of them are on properties of entirely different architectural styles. Importantly, there are no examples of similar extensions along the appeal terrace. There are some differences of front building lines along Lily Street, but not along the appeal terrace. It is acknowledged that the appeal site is not within a conservation area, but this does not justify allowing an extension which harms the character and appearance of an area.
11. For the reasons given above, the development causes harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace, and the surrounding area. Therefore, it does not comply with Policy ENV3 of the Black Country Core Strategy, adopted 2011 and Policy SAD EOS9 of the Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council Site Allocations and Delivery Development Plan Document, adopted 2012. Together these policies seek to resist development that is not of a high-quality design and is out of scale, or incompatible with, its surroundings. The development also fails to comply with the Revised Residential Design Guide SPD which, amongst other criteria, requires that domestic extensions are not out of scale with, and are visually in-keeping with, their surroundings.

Other Matters

12. The appellant states that the introduction of double-glazed windows and doors enhances the safety of the property. However, this could be achieved through the fitting of replacement windows and doors within the original design of the dwelling. The appellant also states that the extension affords easier viewing of visitors to the property, which is stated to be a safety feature. However, it would be possible to view visitors from the original bay window, or through a peep hole in the front door. I do not, therefore, agree that the development has materially increased safety for the occupiers of the dwelling.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Coombes

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

O S Woodward

INSPECTOR