



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 November 2025

by E Pickernell BSc MSC MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G4620/D/25/3368233

74 Stanley Road, Sandwell, Oldbury B68 0EQ

- 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 Nebi Mustafa against the decision of Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/25/70567.
 - The development proposed is roof change, first floor side rear extension & single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I noted at my site visit that the proposed works have been commenced, but work is not complete at the site. Nevertheless, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the drawings which have been submitted.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within a residential street which is primarily characterised by semi-detached dwellings of a similar design, arranged in a relatively regular linear layout. The majority of the properties in the area have hipped roofs. This gives the area a strong degree of consistency which is a positive feature of the area.
5. The appeal property is typical of the area in that it comprises a semi-detached hip-roof dwelling. The plans indicate that prior to works commencing at the site the property had a two storey, flat roof side extension which was approximately half the depth of the host dwelling and projected to the southern boundary of the appeal site.
6. I note that several properties in the area have been extended sideways at roof level, however the majority of these maintain a fully hipped roof form. In contrast, the proposed extension would utilise a half-hip design. This would detract from the original characteristics of the appeal property and would jar awkwardly with the prevailing form of development in the area.

7. The extension to the roof would result in a continuation of the eaves, ridge and plane of the roof of the host dwelling. This lack of a recessive element or subservience to the host dwelling means that the resultant roof would appear overly dominant and bulky and would fail to respect the proportions and design of the original dwelling.
8. Furthermore, because of its overall size and scale, the proposed dormer would dominate both the existing and proposed rear roof slope and would project beyond the plane of the main roof. As a result, this anomalous feature would be clearly visible from vantage points along Stanley Road and Holly Road. It would appear as an incongruous and discordant element in the street scene which would detract from the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the wider area.
9. The enlargement of the side extension would not result in a reduction in the width of the gap between the appeal dwelling and the property to the south. Whilst the roofs of the respective properties would be more closely related as a result of the proposal, they would both slope away from the common boundary and as such the proposal would maintain a moderate degree of separation at roof level. As such the proposal would not result in a terracing effect.
10. Nevertheless, for the reasons given, the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. It would therefore conflict with Policies CSP4 and ENV3 of the Black Country Core Strategy (2011) (CS) and Policies SAD EOS 9 of the Site Allocations and Delivery Development Plan Document (2012). Together these seek to ensure that development proposals achieve a good standard of design and respond to local distinctiveness. For these reasons the proposal would also conflict with advice contained in the Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2014).
11. Policy HOU2 of the CS relates to new housing and has not been determinative in my decision.

Other Matters

12. I note that the proposal would resolve issues in respect of a leaking flat roof, however I am not convinced that this could not be achieved in a way which would be less damaging to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.
13. The appellant contends that elements of the proposal would be permitted development, however this is disputed by the Council. It is not within the remit of this appeal to determine whether the proposed works or part thereof would constitute permitted development. The evidence does not conclusively demonstrate that the harmful elements of the proposal could be achieved under permitted development and as such I attach limited weight to this as a fallback position.
14. My attention has been drawn to extensions at 49 Stanley Road which I observed during my site visit. Whilst not identical to the appeal proposal, this example serves to demonstrate the harmful effect that inappropriate extensions can have on the character and appearance of the area. None of the other extensions I saw in the vicinity are directly comparable to the appeal scheme.

Conclusion

15. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, for the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

E Pickernell

INSPECTOR