



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2025

by **L C Hughes BA (Hons) MTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V4630/D/25/3363508

90 Beacon Street, Walsall WS1 2DJ

- 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 Mohammad Ilyas against the decision of Walsall Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/1507.
 - The development proposed is front extension to extend bedroom and have porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the character and appearance of the area; and
 - highway safety with regards to parking.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Number 90 Beacon Street (No 90) is a semi-detached dwelling in a residential area, located on a slight incline. The surrounding properties are generally of a similar size and age, although there is no strict uniformity in terms of design or style. Due to the sloping topography, the houses do not sit at the same height or level, and No 90 and its semi-detached neighbour sit forward of the adjacent property as the street rises uphill. Notwithstanding this, the dwellings in proximity follow a broadly linear and uniform building line set back from the pavement behind front gardens and driveways. This results in a well-ordered layout which gives a pleasing degree of visual consistency and cohesiveness which contributes positively to the street scene.
4. The proposed front ground floor extension would use matching materials to blend with the host property. However, it would extend forward of the established building line and would run the width of No 90. It would be a dominant and prominent feature that would be untypical of neighbouring dwellings. It would unbalance the pattern of development and would jar within the context of the surrounding properties, failing to assimilate with its surroundings, regardless of the lack of dwellings directly opposite. This would be to the detriment of local character.

5. Whilst several neighbouring properties have had porch extensions, these are smaller in size than the proposal, do not project forward of the building line to any notable extent, and as such are not obtrusive.
6. There are a small number of similar extensions to that proposed in neighbouring streets, but these are some distance removed from No 90 and not all of the examples appear to have as deep a forward projection as that proposed. Consistency in decision making is important. However, full details of these cases have not been provided, and I am not aware of the material planning considerations in each case, which must be determined on their own merits and site-specific circumstances. The presence of these limited examples does not overcome my concerns with the proposed extension, which, for the reasons set out, would appear incongruous amongst its immediate surroundings.
7. The proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would be contrary to saved Policies GP2 and ENV32 of the Walsall Unitary Development Plan (2005) (UDP) which seek to ensure that development does not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the environment and considers the local character of the area. It would also conflict with Policies CSP4, ENV2 and ENV3 of the Black Country Core Strategy (2011) which highlight that development should make a positive contribution to place making, protect local distinctiveness and be of a high quality design.

Highway safety

8. The proposed extension would lead to a loss of parking space on the drive of No 90. UDP Policy T13 gives parking standards for residential properties, and a four bedroomed property is required to provide three parking spaces. On my site visit, which I acknowledge was only a snapshot in time, I did not notice any parking issues, and there were no parking restrictions on the street. No 90 would retain an element of parking space, and there are opportunities for on street parking without blocking neighbouring drives. There are no access points to properties on the opposite side of the road from No 90, but rather a long wall and pavement which would allow for on street parking for vehicles, if necessary, without impacting residents. There would be sufficient on street parking to accommodate any overspill without any significantly harmful effect on highway safety.
9. The proposal would therefore not harm highway safety with regard to parking. As such, I find no conflict with the aims of saved Policies GP2 and T13 of the UDP, which seek to ensure that development provides sufficient car parking.

Other Matters

10. The absence of objections to the proposal from neighbours and interested parties does not change my conclusions on the appeal scheme. A lack of objections is not a reason in itself to approve unacceptable development.
11. The Council had no concerns relating to the acceptability of the proposal with regards to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. Nevertheless, the lack of harm is a neutral factor that does not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area that I have identified.
12. It is suggested that the scheme could be revised or agreed by way of condition. However, the primary harm identified relates to the projection and size of the

proposed front extension. This could not be overcome by conditions without fundamentally altering the scheme. Moreover, the purpose of an appeal is not to amend a scheme which has been the subject of public consultation. This would be prejudicial to interested parties that would not have had the opportunity to comment on any amended plans.

Conclusion

13. The development would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole and material considerations do not indicate that the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.
14. As a result, the appeal should be dismissed.

L C Hughes

INSPECTOR