

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2023

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/C4615/D/22/3308957

75 Princess Crescent, Halesowen, Dudley, B63 3QE

- 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 Mrs J Bates against the decision of Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P22/0953, dated 24 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is a first floor front elevation extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appellant points out that the proposal the subject of this appeal comprises an amended scheme to that originally proposed and that changes were made in response to concerns raised by the Council.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling. It has a garden to the rear, a small single storey extension to the front and is set back from the road behind a driveway.
 5. The appeal property is located within a residential area characterised by the presence of detached and semi-detached dwellings set back from the road behind front gardens and/or parking areas and with gardens to the rear.
 6. During my site visit, I observed that many dwellings in the area have been altered and/or extended and that these changes generally appear in keeping with host properties and their surroundings.
 7. I also noted during my site visit that the area is characterised by small groups of very similar dwelling types. This, the presence of gardens, the regular set back of dwellings and a commonality in respect of brick and tile roofs, provides for a pleasant sense of symmetry, greenery and spaciousness.
-

8. The appeal property is one of two pairs of semi-detached dwellings of very similar appearance. To the front, each of the four dwellings have cat-slip roofs, small dormers which project modestly from the roof slope and integral single garages. Each dwelling is different at ground floor level, but these differences do not appear so significant as to detract from the significant sense of uniformity afforded by the overall similarity of the dwellings.
9. The proposed development would introduce a markedly different form of development. The garage and front door would be replaced by windows and the dormer would be replaced by a significantly larger dormer, which would extend across much of the front of the dwelling and project considerably further forward than the existing dormer.
10. I find that the resultant extension would jar with and overwhelm the appearance of the host property. The large proposed dormer would dominate rather than appear sympathetic to the host dwelling's cat slide roof and would draw attention to itself as a large, prominent and ungainly addition.
11. The harm arising from this would be exacerbated by the proposed use of metal cladding. This would appear as an alien material out of keeping with the brick and tile materials of the host property and its neighbours. It would serve to exaggerate the incongruous appearance of the proposed dormer.
12. Further to the above, the proposal would introduce a form of development so strikingly different to the appearance of neighbouring dwellings as to severely detract from the area's sense of uniformity. In particular, the degree of symmetry that currently exists between the appeal property and its adjoining neighbour, Number 77 Princess Crescent, would be greatly eroded, not least by the introduction of a dormer that would appear large, bulky and awkward, in sharp contrast to No 77's modest original dormer.
13. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Core Strategy¹ Policy ENV2; to Development Strategy² Policies L1 and S6; and to the Council's House Extensions SPG³, which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

14. In support of the proposed development, the appellant draws attention to other extensions, alterations and elevational changes elsewhere. However, I have found that the proposal would result in harm and this is not a matter mitigated or outweighed by the presence of other developments elsewhere

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR

¹ Reference: Black Country Core Strategy (2011).

² Reference: Dudley Borough Development Strategy (2017).

³ Reference: Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 17 (House Extension Design Guide) (1998).