

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 July 2025

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C4615/D/25/3366041

12 Quentin Drive, Dudley, DY1 2HL

- 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 Mrs Alice Mulyankal against the decision of Dudley Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is P25/0188.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at 12 Quentin Drive, Dudley, DY1 2HL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P25/0188, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions below:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision;
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the original building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of Number 10 Quentin Drive, with regards to outlook and daylight.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a detached dwelling which has the appearance of a tall dormer bungalow and provides two stories of accommodation. The dwelling has a single storey porch to the side and has a conservatory and a small single storey extension to the rear.
 4. It is located in a residential area, characterised by the presence of detached two storey dwellings set back from the road behind front gardens and/or parking areas and with longer gardens to the rear. This provides for a spacious character.
-

5. During my site visit, I observed that many dwellings have been altered and/or extended, with plentiful evidence of changes to the front, rear, side and roofs of dwellings.
6. The proposed development would extend from the existing small single storey rear extension. This existing extension is brick-built with a low flat roof, and the proposal would extend at the same height, utilising matching materials.
7. This would result in a modest addition. It would extend a short distance to the rear and would only be little higher than the adjacent shared boundary fence between the appeal dwelling and its neighbour, Number 10 Quentin Drive. Given this, only a very small part of the proposed development would be visible above the intervening boundary feature.
8. As a consequence of the above, the proposal would not result in any significant difference in outlook from the rear of Number 10 Quentin Drive. Further, I find that the low height, flat roof and modest projection of the proposal would not result in any significant change to the amount of daylight received and nor would it result in anything other than a very minor increase in overshadowing. There is no substantive evidence before me to demonstrate that any significant harm would arise in respect of daylight and overshadowing.
9. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers of Number 10 Quentin Drive, with regards to outlook and daylight and would not be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Policy L1 of the Dudley Borough Development Strategy (2017); or to the Council's Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2023), which together amongst other things, seek to protect residential amenity.

Conditions

10. I have considered the conditions against the tests set out in Paragraph 57 of the Framework. I find that a condition specifying materials is necessary in the interests of local character.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is successful.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR