

Report to Planning Committee

23 July 2025

Application reference	DC/25/70522
Application address	16 Tapestries Avenue West Bromwich B70 9NP
Application description	Proposed single storey side and rear extension, front porch and outbuilding in rear garden.
Application received	7 April 2025
Ward	Greets Green and Lyng
Contact officer	Dave Paine david_paine@sandwell.gov.uk

1. Recommendations

That planning permission is granted subject to the following conditions relating to:

- i) External materials; and
- ii) A parking layout plan.

2. Reasons for Recommendations

- 2.1 The proposal is acceptable as it has no significant impact on the amenity of the occupiers of the adjacent properties and the design and scale is appropriate to existing property and the surrounding area.

3. How does this deliver objectives of the Council Plan?

Living in Sandwell	Increasing opportunities and options for residents.
--------------------	---

4. Context

- 4.1 The application is being reported to Planning Committee as six material planning objections have been received.
- 4.2 To assist members with site context, a link to Google Maps is provided below:

[16 Tapestries Avenue](#)

5. Key Considerations

- 5.1 The site is not allocated in the development plan.
- 5.2 Material planning considerations (MPCs) are matters that can and should be taken into account when making planning decisions. By law, planning decisions should be made in accordance with the development plan unless MPCs indicate otherwise. This means that if enough MPCs weigh in favour of a development, it should be approved even if it conflicts with a local planning policy.

5.3 The material planning considerations which are relevant to this application are:

- Government policy (NPPF);
- Amenity concerns – overlooking/loss of privacy, loss of light and/or outlook and overshadowing;
- Design concerns - appearance and materials, layout of the building and wider visual amenity.

6. The Application Site

6.1 This application relates to a linked-detached dwelling situated on the north side of Tapestries Avenue. This is a residential cul-de-sac, which was granted planning permission in 1977. The dwellings on this cul-de-sac are mostly of a similar scale and appearance, but with notable differences in design, particularly with regard to roof construction. A number of nearby dwellings have existing one and two storey extensions. The street-scene along Tapestries Avenue does not significantly slope but the overall plot of 16 Tapestries Avenue rises up towards the far end of the rear garden.

7. Planning History

7.1 The original planning application for 30 new homes was granted in 1977.

7.2 Relevant planning applications are as follows:

DC/05656	Erection of 30 dwellings and garages.	Grant Permission subject to Conditions 05 October 1977
----------	---------------------------------------	---

8. Application Details

8.1 The applicant is proposing to construct a single storey side and rear wraparound extension, a front porch and an outbuilding in the rear garden.

- 8.2 The extension would have a width of 2.4m to the side and 7.7m across the rear. The depth of the rear extension would be 4.0m and the height of the wraparound extension would 2.75m with an additional 0.5m to the apex of the pitched roof at the front. It would create an enlarged kitchen, a study, a ground floor bathroom and an additional lounge, and would result in the loss of a garage measuring (internally), 2.2m wide by 6.9m deep.
- 8.3 The proposed porch would measure 1.2m deep by 2.0m wide by 3.3m high.
- 8.4 The proposed outbuilding would measure 6.0m deep by 7.5m wide by 2.5m high.

9. Publicity

- 9.1 The application has been publicised by six neighbour notification letters. Six objections have been received.
- 9.2 Objections have been received on the following grounds:
- i) The attaching of the proposed extension to the neighbouring property would create a terracing effect.
 - ii) The proposal would have a negative impact on the character of the street due to an increase in height, the depth of the rear extension and the forwards projection of the proposed porch.
 - iii) The proposed outbuilding and porch would cause a loss of privacy to occupiers of the neighbouring properties.
 - iv) The proposal would cause a loss of light to neighbours due to the height of the extension and the depth of the extension to the rear.

These objections will be addressed in under paragraph 13 (Material Considerations).

- 9.3 Non-material objections have been raised regarding the proposed construction method.

10. Consultee responses

10.1 Highways

The Highways officer noted that there would be a loss of one parking space and that the dwelling would require two parking spaces. They requested that a planning condition be applied to any approval to request that a suitable parking plan should be provided prior to commencement and should thereafter be implemented and retained.

11. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 11.1 The NPPF sets out government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.
- 11.2 The framework refers to development adding to the overall quality of the area by achieving high quality design, achieving good architecture and layouts.
- 11.3 I am of the opinion that the scheme is of a good design and would assimilate into the overall form and layout of the site's surroundings; in accordance with the design principles of the NPPF.

12. Development Plan Policy

- 12.1 The following policies of the council's development plan are relevant:

Black Country Core Strategy (BCCS)

ENV3 – Design Quality

Site Allocations and Delivery Development Plan Document – (SADD)

SAD EOS 9 - Urban Design Principles

- 12.2 ENV3 and SAD EOS9 refer to well-designed schemes that provide quality living environments. The proposed layout and design are considered to be acceptable, blending well with the existing property and other extensions in the vicinity. The scale and massing of the development would be in proportion to the existing dwelling.

13. Material Considerations

- 13.1 National and local planning policy considerations have been referred to above in Sections 11 and 12. With regards to the other material considerations, these are highlighted below:

Amenity concerns – loss of privacy, light and outlook

- 13.2 The proposed wraparound extension would not project forwards of the existing building line of the property, or its neighbour. There are no existing ground floor side windows on the neighbouring property. The rear extension would project approximately 1.0m beyond the rear walls of the existing neighbouring extensions. No part of the proposed wraparound extension would cross any 45 degree line. For these reasons, I do not consider that the wraparound extension would cause any loss of light, outlook or privacy.
- 13.3 The proposed porch would be similar in design and scale to the existing porch on the neighbouring property to the west. It would not cross any 45 degree line, and is therefore considered acceptable in terms of loss of light and outlook. Occupants of the porch would not be afforded any views into neighbour properties which would significantly impact on privacy.

- 13.4 The proposed outbuilding would be positioned at the end of the garden, at a higher elevation than the rear of the building. It would have windows facing towards the rear of the property and the neighbouring properties. The General Permitted Development Order (GPDO) allows for outbuildings such as the one proposed to be built up to 2.5m high if the total built up area within the curtilage of the property would not exceed 50% and the outbuilding would be required for a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse. I am satisfied that this proposal meets these requirements given that the intended purpose would be for storage and that the loss of the garage space would necessitate the creation of a new storage area, and that the height of the proposed outbuilding would be 2.5m when measured from ground level.
- 13.5 Given that the outbuilding would meet the requirements of the GPDO, I consider that any potential loss of privacy caused, would not be reasonably subject to planning control.

Design concerns - appearance and materials, terracing effect and impact on the character of the street.

- 13.6 The applicant's property is currently a linked-detached dwelling with a garage to the side, and is typical of the type of dwelling found on this street. The alterations would replace the garage with a side extension which would be flush with the front building line of the street. The front of the side extension would have a window and a door. Extensions of this sort can be found at a number of properties on the street and have therefore become characteristic of the area.
- 13.7 The alterations to the rear would not be visible from the public realm and therefore would not impact on the character of the street. It should be noted that many properties on the street have existing rear extensions, including both neighbouring properties. A further rear extension at number 16 would not therefore be out of place in its surroundings.

13.8 Concerns relating to the creation of a terracing effect would typically relate to two-storey extensions with no set back, filling a gap between two dwellings. In this case, the side extension would be single storey and would replace the existing garage. Therefore it is considered that no terracing effect would occur.

14. Conclusion and planning balance

14.1 All decisions on planning applications should be based on an objective balancing exercise. This is known as applying the 'planning balance'. To summarise: the proposal should be approved unless any adverse impacts of granting the permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against development plan policies or, where those policies are out of date, the NPPF as a whole. Where national policy takes precedence over the development plan, this has been highlighted in paragraph 11 (National Planning Policy Framework).

14.2 On balance the proposal accords with the provisions of relevant development plan policies and there are no significant material considerations which warrant refusal that could not be controlled by conditions.

15. Alternative Options

15.1 Refusal of the application is an option if there are material planning reasons for doing so. In my opinion the proposal is compliant with relevant policies and there are no material considerations that would justify refusal.

16. Implications

Resources:	There are no direct implications in terms of the Council's strategic resources. If the Planning Inspectorate overturns the Committee's decision and grants consent, the Council may be required to pay the costs of such an appeal, for which there is no designated budget.
Legal and Governance:	The Planning Committee has delegated powers to determine planning applications within current Council policy. Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 gives applicants a right to appeal when they disagree with the local authority's decision on their application, or where the local authority has failed to determine the application within the statutory timeframe
Risk:	There are no risks associated with this report.
Equality:	There are no equality implications associated with this report.
Health and Wellbeing:	There are no health and wellbeing implications associated with this report.
Social Value	There are no implications linked to social value with this report.
Corporate Parenting	None.

17. Appendices

17.1 Plans for consideration

Location Plan

Block Plan

1 of 3 B - Existing and Proposed Ground Floor Plan

2 of 3 A - Existing and Proposed Elevations

3 of 3 - Proposed Outbuilding Floor Plan and Elevations