



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2022

by Helen Smith BSc (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C4615/D/22/3304347

15 Eastwood Road, Dudley, West Midlands DY2 8BU

- 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 C. Callagan against the decision of Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P22/0609, dated 26 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as "single storey side extension to end terraced house, to form bedroom with ensuite shower room, utility room and toilet cubicle."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the proposal's effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on a prominent corner to the side of 15 Eastwood Road (No 15). No 15 is the end dwelling of a row of four two-storey terraced dwellings whose consistency of design, width, scale, fenestration rhythm and materials lend a pleasant uniformity to the street scene which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The terraced dwellings are set back from the road within an established building line. Although plot sizes vary, the end corner plots have relatively more space around them than the other dwellings. This conveys a sense of space and contributes to the open character of the area.
5. The front elevation of the proposed extension would be aligned with the main front elevation of No 15, and consequently the proposal would not appear as a subservient addition to the existing building. Furthermore, the proposal's width and scale would introduce significant bulk to the side of the building. In addition, the proposal's side elevation would have a bland appearance. Therefore, the proposal would appear as a highly visible, dominant, and incongruous feature within the street scene.
6. The proposal's roof form would comprise of a flat roof and mock pitch on all elevations. This contrived roof form would be at odds with the existing roof form of No 15 and would interrupt the roof profile of this group of dwellings. This would detract from the street-scene and have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the area.

7. These factors would combine to unacceptably disrupt the uniform rhythm and symmetry of the terrace, adversely affecting its collective harmony. Furthermore, the presence and massing of the proposed extension would significantly erode the sense of openness of this prominent corner plot.
8. Therefore, I conclude the proposal would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the area. As such, the proposal would fail to accord with Policies L1 and S6 of the Dudley Borough Development Strategy (2017), and Policy ENV2 of the Black Country Core Strategy (2011). Collectively, these policies amongst other things, seek to ensure new development is appropriately designed and respects the context and character of the local area. The proposal would also conflict with the Council's Planning Guidance Note No. 17: House Extension Design Guide (PGN17), which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure extensions relate to the design of the original building.
9. In addition, the proposal would fail to accord to the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

10. The design and siting of the proposed extension would not be detrimental to the living conditions of any neighbours. Nevertheless, a lack of harm in this regard does not weigh in favour of the proposal.
11. In the appellant's statement he refers to a 3.6 width 2-storey extension. However, there is no information before me which indicates the design such a development might take, or the likelihood of such a course of action being pursued. On this basis, it carries little weight in my decision, and is not sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

12. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole, and there are no material considerations worthy of sufficient weight that would indicate a decision other than in accordance with it. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Helen Smith

INSPECTOR