



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 May 2024

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/C4615/D/24/3339979
74 Parkfield Road, Stourbridge, DY8 1EY

- 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 Oliver Chivers against the decision of Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P23/1340, dated 13 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 11 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Single Storey Side/Front Extension'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. Parkfield Road is a long, sloping U-shaped road that has three sections. The appeal site is located towards the top of the southern section. Whilst there are exceptions, dwellings are predominantly inter-war built semi-detached houses with hipped roofs and projecting bays and whilst built to slightly varying designs, each pair was built with a strong sense of symmetry, balance and proportion. Over the years many have been altered or extended but most dwellings have not been extended to the side or with new canopies and in general the front elevations retain much of their original character.
3. The existing appeal dwelling has not been extended to the side. Its adjoining neighbour at no 76 has a narrow single storey extension on its side elevation but that is set back from the main front wall and appears subservient to the main part of the house, maintaining the overall original form of the pair. Overall, the pair is balanced and symmetrical which, together with the retention of the original canopy detail over the front doors, maintains its character and results in a pleasing appearance.
4. The proposed development would extend the dwelling along the whole length of its side elevation, projecting forward of the main front wall by 0.9m. It would have a half hipped roof, extending into a canopy above the existing front door.
5. Prior to this proposal, an application was made earlier in 2023 for the same scheme as proposed here. Following the officer's intention to refuse that, amended plans were submitted which removed the front projection so that the side extension was aligned with the main front wall, with only a canopy

projecting by 0.75m to the front of the existing property. That scheme was approved by the Council. The difference between the schemes is that the current proposal now includes the forward projection of the extension by 0.9m and the canopy projects a further 0.15m than as approved.

6. As the dwelling is sited close to the brow of the hill where the gradient of the road increases, its side elevation is seen clearly within the street scene. Although the projection of the extension and the additional projection of the canopy would be small, it would obscure the view of the ground floor projecting bay in the approach uphill towards the dwelling from the east. As the projecting bays are one of the principal characteristics of these dwellings and should remain a dominant feature, that would undermine the character of the dwelling. When seen in that approach, the extension would appear overly dominant in the street scene rather than as a subservient addition as in the extant approval.
7. I have noted the other examples on Parkfield Road referred to by the appellant but I have not been made aware of the planning status of those. In any case, none of those are seen within the same immediate context as the appeal site as they are either over the brow of the hill or at the far end of the road or in the northern section of the road. Not all of those reflect the character of their host dwelling or contribute positively to the street scene. Those examples do not, therefore, persuade me to alter my findings in regard to this proposal.
8. I find then that the proposed development, by reason of its forward projection, would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area. It would be contrary to development plan policies L1 and S6 of the Dudley Borough Development Strategy (2017) that together seek to encourage developments of an appropriate scale and mass that respect the character of the surrounding area.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposed development is contrary to the development plan and there are no material considerations that would outweigh that. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector