



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2022

by K Ford MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C4615/D/22/3307189

23 Sorrel Walk, Quarry Bank, Brierley Hill DY5 2QG

- 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 and Mrs Thomas against the decision of Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P22/1074, dated 18 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached dwelling in a staggered row of similarly styled properties on land that is on a sloping gradient. There is a general symmetry of properties within the street scene. No 23 stands notably forward of a neighbouring property, No 25. The property currently has a small single storey extension to the front of the dwelling.
4. The proposed single storey front extension would project forward of the main dwelling, the impact of which would be exaggerated by the extent of the setback of No 25. As a consequence it would create a prominent incongruous addition at odds with the symmetry of properties in the road. The proposed materials to match the existing dwelling would not mitigate the harm. Rather than adding to the architectural interest, as suggested by the appellant, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area.
5. The development would harm the character and appearance of the area and so consequently would conflict with the part of Policy ENV2 of the Black Country Core Strategy 2011 which requires all development to protect local distinctiveness and preserve and where appropriate enhance local character. It would also conflict with Policy S6 and Policy L1 of the Dudley Borough Development Strategy 2017. Amongst other things, these policies support development where it is responsive to the context and character of the surrounding area and requires development to be of an appropriate form, siting, scale and mass.

Other Matters

6. I note the personal circumstances of the appellant. I sympathise with this situation. The development would provide an adapted living space for the occupant to meet their needs. However, I have not been provided with any substantive evidence to demonstrate that the extension would provide the only option in terms of making adjustments to improve the living conditions within the home. The benefits of the proposal are outweighed by the harm that would arise from it.
7. The appellant refers to a 2 storey extension elsewhere on Sorrel Walk in support of their case. However, the location within the road and stagger of properties is different and therefore not directly comparable to the case before me. In any event, each case is determined on its own merits and my assessment is based on the information submitted.
8. The appellant has also identified that the scheme would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring properties. Be that as it may, it does not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons identified, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Ford

INSPECTOR