



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 January 2025 by S Indermaur

Decision by B Plenty BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C4615/D/24/3355535

112 Cot Lane, Kingswinford, West Midlands DY6 9UB

- 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 Katie Whitehouse against the decision of Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P24/1006.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey front/side extension.
-

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.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on;
 - the character and appearance of the property, neighbouring semi-detached dwelling and surrounding area; and
 - highway safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property a semi-detached property that sits within a pair that shares a similar design and appearance. These properties exhibit a brick finish with a pitched roof, similar fenestration, porches, and garages set to the side that link to the neighbouring dwellings. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character, consisting of a variety of house designs and materials. The adjacent neighbouring property No.114 is a link-detached dwelling that also has a brick finish and a pitched roof. However, this dwelling exhibits different fenestration and detailing to the appeal property and is situated on a corner plot, forward of the appeal properties principal elevation by a considerable distance. The appeal dwelling, as one of a semi-detached pair, makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.

5. To an extent the proposed scheme would replicate the varying designs of local housing where there are also some examples with gable frontages. However, the appeal property is seen as one of a pair of semi-dwellings. These two dwellings have a similar appearance and are absent a front extension or front projecting pitched roof. Therefore, even though the proposed front addition would not project forward significantly, the proposed front extension and its pronounced gable roof would not be in keeping with the character of these properties. This would unbalance the pair of dwellings, causing a substantial loss of symmetry and uniformity.
6. With regards to the two storey side extensions to semi-detached dwellings, the proposal would conflict with the guidance set out in the Residential Design Guide SPD 2023 (RDG). The RDG states that the first floor should be set back by at least 0.75m with respect to the principal elevation of a house and the ridgeline set down with respect to that of the original house. In contrast to this guidance, the proposed side extension would use the same front building line as the existing property. Whilst the RDG is only guidance, fully infilling this gap without setting it back and down would appear as dominant and would cause a terracing effect, conjoining the proposal to No 114. Furthermore, although the appeal property is already attached to No.114 at ground floor level, removing the entire gap between the appeal property and No.114 would further unbalance the pair of semi-detached houses.
7. Overall, the extensions together would appear as an obtrusive addition that would not relate well to the design of the original house and would not be subordinate in terms of scale. Although the proposal would somewhat act as a transition of front building lines, this would not be considered as a benefit to the street scene due to the harmful effects identified above. A potential alternative scheme, involving a recessive side extension as discussed by the appellant, may cause issues with respect to access to natural light and is not therefore favoured by the appellant. However, the potential disbenefits of an alternative scheme can only have a limited bearing on the merits of the appeal proposal.
8. For the reasons outlined above, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the property, neighbouring semi-detached dwelling and surrounding area. The proposal would conflict with Policies S6 and L1 of the Dudley Borough Development Strategy 2017 (DS) which together state that extensions to existing dwellings will be permitted provided that the design of the development is of an appropriate form and scale which respects the character of the local area does and not have a detrimental impact on the form and design of the host dwelling.

Highway Safety

9. Parking spaces are currently located to the front of the property. The proposal includes the demolition of the existing garage and the addition of a bedroom, which would create a 4-bed dwelling. The Parking Standards SPD (2017) outlines that a 4-bedroom dwelling should have 3 dedicated spaces with a dimension of at least 2.5m x 5.3m. From the submitted amended layout plan, it is evident that three parking spaces could be provided to the front of the appeal property. As such, the proposal would not be likely to create on-street parking demand. As a result, the proposal would not create or exacerbate issues of highway safety.

10. As outlined above, the proposal would not cause harm to highway safety. As such the proposal would fulfil Policy L1 of the DS which states that extensions to existing dwellings will be permitted provided that the development would provide adequate parking with no detrimental impact on highway safety and free flow of traffic.

Other Matters

11. Policy ENV2 of the Black Country Core Strategy (2011) and DS Policy S8 deal with historic character and conservation matters. As such, these Policies are not relevant to this case, as a result these weigh neither for nor against the proposal.
12. General reference has been made to an example of attached properties that step forward from each other, but the proposal is within a different context. In any event, each case must be considered on its own merits and this matter is given limited weight.
13. There would be benefits of having extra space in the property to accommodate a growing family. Furthermore, it is noted that the appellant asserts he has carefully considered the proposed design. However, these matters only gain limited weight in support of the proposal that would not outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. The proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the property, neighbouring semi-detached dwelling and surrounding area. This would not be outweighed by the lack of harm identified to highway safety. Therefore, the proposal would conflict with the development plan read as a whole and there are no material considerations that justify granting permission. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Indermaur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Ben Plenty

INSPECTOR