



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2025 by M Long BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G4620/D/24/3357136

28 Hackett Road, Rowley Regis, Sandwell B65 0RP

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Orgille Taylor against the decision of Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/24/69512.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension to existing single family home.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. The proposed drawings indicate that the first-floor front elevation of the extension would be marginally set back from the ground floor front elevation of the extension. Indeed, the description of the proposal on the Council's decision notice states 'Proposed two and single storey side extension'. In any case, I have used the description of the proposal on the planning application form for the purpose of the appeal banner heading as it accurately defines the substantive scale and position of the proposal and, when read in conjunction with the proposed plans and supporting evidence, the premise of the appeal proposal is clear.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The site is in a residential estate largely comprised of semi-detached pairs and short terraces of a similar architectural style which contribute to a prevailing sense of consistency in the street scene. Located on a prominent corner plot, the appeal dwelling forms part of a semi-detached pair characterised by symmetry owing to their comparable widths, balanced hipped roof profile with a central chimney, similar external materials and a mirrored fenestration pattern. Many of the other semi-detached pairs in the area also have comparable widths to one another. There are some limited instances close to the appeal site where side extensions

have reduced symmetry including for example at No 27 Hackett Road (No 27), which is on the opposing corner to the appeal site.

6. Due to the considerable width of the side extension, it would compete with the width of its host. Its dominance would be emphasised by the greater width of its ridgeline in comparison to the ridgeline of the main dwelling, as well as the ground floor front window which would be much wider than existing windows on the principal elevation of the dwelling.
7. While the extension would be set down from the ridgeline and set back from the front, this would only be by marginal distances. I also accept that matching external materials would be utilised. Even so, these factors would not be sufficient to assimilate the unsympathetic scale of the extension with its host, nor would they mitigate the unacceptable loss of symmetry across the semi-detached pair.
8. While two-storey in scale, the side extension at No 27 does not have as wide an appearance as the appeal proposal and it also has window openings that relate more closely to the size of other windows on the front elevation of No 27. Therefore, when viewed together, the proposal would not clearly reflect this neighbouring extension. Furthermore, this nearby extension and the one at 66 Harrold Road were considered in a different planning policy context as they were granted planning permission in 2007 and therefore prior to the current development plan and the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework. In any case, they do not reflect the prevailing order and consistency in the area which includes many semi-detached pairs which retain an overall symmetry.
9. I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would not accord with Policy SAD EOS 9 (Urban Design Principles) of the Sandwell Site Allocations and Delivery Development Plan Document (2012) which seeks to prevent poor designs, particularly those that are inappropriate in their locality, for example, those clearly out of scale with or incompatible with their surroundings. It would also conflict with Policy ENV3 (Design Quality) of the Black Country Core Strategy (2011) which seeks high quality design.
10. For the same reasons, the proposal also conflicts with the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character, and the Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council's Revised Residential Design Guide: Supplementary Planning Document (2014) which sets out that extensions must be in proportion to the scale of the existing dwelling and street scene.

Other Matters

11. The proposal would improve the living accommodation available to current and future occupiers, particularly in terms of the potential to meet the needs of larger families and those working from home. Nevertheless, this is a private benefit to a single household and does not justify the harm to the character and appearance of the area.
12. The proposal would generate economic benefits in its construction and furnishing and may potentially increase the council tax payable. However, in the context of an extension to an extension to an existing dwelling, such benefits would be modest and do not outweigh the identified harm. The lack of concerns raised with regard to

issues such as local ecology, safety and crime also do not justify the harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

M Long

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR