

<b>Council/Committee:</b>	Planning Committee
<b>Date of Meeting</b>	07 January 2026
<b>Application Reference</b>	DC/25/71117
<b>Application Description</b>	Proposed single storey rear extension, first floor side extension, and loft conversion with dormer to the rear.
<b>Application Received</b>	16 October 2025
<b>Application Address</b>	120 Scott Road Great Barr Birmingham B43 6JU
<b>Report Author</b>	Dave Paine david_paine@sandwell.gov.uk
<b>Lead Officer</b>	Tammy Stokes
<b>Ward</b>	Great Barr with Yew Tree
<b>Appendices (if any)</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. MC/3099/01. REV A – Existing floor plans and elevations.</li> <li>2. MC/3099/02. REV A – Proposed floor plans and elevations.</li> <li>3. MC/3099/03. REV A – Proposed second floor plan.</li> <li>4. MC/3099/04. REV A – Existing location and block plan.</li> <li>5. MC/3099/05. REV A – Proposed local and block plan.</li> </ol>

## 1. Application Summary

- 1.1 The application is being reported to Planning Committee because four material planning objections have been received.
- 1.2 To assist members with site context, a link to Google Maps is provided below:  
[120 Scott Road](#)

## 2. Recommendations

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

- i) External materials;

### **3. Reasons for the recommendation and conditions**

- 3.1 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 are appropriate to the existing property and the surrounding area. The proposal adheres to the requirements and objectives of the Sandwell Revised Residential Design Guide (2014).

### **4. Key Considerations**

- 4.1 The site is not allocated in the development plan and the use remains as a dwelling.
- 4.2 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.
- 4.3 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.

### **5. The Application Site**

- 5.1 This application relates to a semi-detached dwelling situated on the north side of Scott Road. The character of the area is residential with semi-detached dwellings of a variety of designs. A number of nearby dwellings have existing extensions and alterations, including the applicant's property. The street-scene along Scott Road slopes upwards from east to west.

## 5.2 Planning History

Planning permission was granted for a first-floor side extension in 2002. A full list of the planning history is provided below:

DC/01/38331	First floor bedroom extension.	Refused 03/12/2001
DC/02/39665	First floor side extension (re-submission of refused application DC/01/38331)	Approved 28/10/2002

## 6. Application Details

- 6.1 The applicant is proposing to construct a single-storey rear extension, a first-floor side extension and a rear dormer window.
- 6.2 The rear extension would have a depth of 3.0m, a width of 10.4m and a height of 3.6m. The first-floor side extension would have a depth of 4.2m, a width of 4.0m and a height of 6.9m. Initial plans submitted for the dormer window show a depth of 4.0m, a width of 7.0m and a height of 2.7m. Amended plans for the dormer window show a reduced depth of 3.4m, a width of 5.0m and a height of 2.5m.
- 6.3 The alterations would create an enlarged kitchen and living room, a ground floor shower room, an additional bedroom on the first floor and an additional bedroom in the loft level.

## 7. Publicity

- 7.1 The application has been publicised by six neighbour notification letters. Four objections have been received (albeit two from the same person) and are summarised below:
- a. Loss of privacy due to proposed rear facing windows.
  - b. Loss of light to neighbouring properties and gardens.
  - c. The creation of a 3-storey property would be an eye-sore.
  - d. Concerns relating to construction noise.
  - e. Overdevelopment of the site.

Non-material objections have been raised regarding drainage concerns due to additional bathrooms, impact on property values, and impact on privacy due to construction.

## **8. Consultee Responses**

### **8.1 Highways**

The Highways officer had no objections to the application. They noted that the number of bedrooms would increase to five and that Sandwell's parking standards require three parking spaces for a property of this size. The current driveway can comfortably accommodate three vehicles.

## **9. Relevant Planning Policy Considerations**

### **9.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

The NPPF sets out government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.

#### Design

The framework refers to development adding to the overall quality of the area by achieving high quality design, achieving good architecture and layouts.

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.

#### Highway safety

The framework promotes sustainable transport options for development proposal and states that developments should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

### **9.2 Development Plan Policy**

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

#### **Black Country Core Strategy (BCCS)**

ENV3 – Design Quality - refers to well-designed schemes that provide quality living environments. The proposed layout and design are considered to be acceptable.

#### **Site Allocations and Delivery Development Plan Document – (SADD)**

SAD EOS 9 - Urban Design Principles – the proposal is appropriate to the location in terms of scale and design.

## **10. Material Considerations**

- 10.1 National and local planning policy considerations have been referred to above in Sections 9.1 and 9.2. With regards to the other material considerations, these are highlighted below.

### **10.2 Amenity concerns – loss of light, outlook and privacy.**

The proposed extensions and alterations would be located towards the rear of the property and have been designed to minimise amenity impacts on neighbouring properties.

In terms of loss of light and outlook, the ground floor rear extension would not cross any relevant 45-degree line, due to existing rear extensions on both neighbouring properties on either side. The first-floor extension would sit within the current footprint of the dwellinghouse and would be angled away from the neighbouring property to the east, ensuring the 45-degree line would not be compromised.

The primary concern raised by objectors relates to a loss of privacy caused by proposed rear facing windows. The Council's Residential Design Guide provides guidance in this area, stating: *"Separation distance of 21 metres (minimum) between building rear faces from two storey dwellings, rising to 27.5 metres for three storeys and above and/or where main living room and kitchen windows are located above ground floor, the potential for overlooking existing neighbouring dwellings exists or where levels exacerbate the problem."* In this case, there is a potential for overlooking existing neighbouring dwellings, however the separation distance between the rear elevation of the dormer window of 120 Scott Road and the rear of the nearest property on Whitecrest is 34 metres, which comfortably exceeds the Council's guidance. In addition, whilst the proposed dormer would introduce additional windows at a higher level, this is already evident on nearby properties where dormer windows already exist. For these reasons, it is considered that the overall loss of privacy caused by this proposal would be minimal.

### **10.5 Design concerns – appearance and scale**

Initial plans showed a rear dormer which was considered unacceptable in scale and appearance, and which would correspond poorly with the proposed first floor side extension. Amended plans were submitted, reducing the dimensions of the dormer to that described in paragraph 6.2 which is now considered to be proportionate in scale and massing to the rear elevation. This would ensure the appearance would be acceptable. The revised plans submitted with this application, now incorporate subservient extension to the property and depict a scheme which would be compatible with its surroundings, being of good design and would cause no harm to visual amenity of the area. It is therefore considered compliant with local policies BCCS ENV3 and SAD EOS9, the residential design guide and the NPPF.

## **11. Conclusion**

- 11.1 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 9.1 (National Planning Policy Framework).
- 11.2 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.

## **12. Legal and Governance Implications**

- 12.1 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

## **13. Other Relevant Implications**

- 13.1 None.

## **14. Background Documents**

- 14.1 None.

## **15. How does this deliver the objectives of the Strategic Themes?**

- 15.1 All of our residents, including our children and young people, are active participants in influencing change – through being listened to, their opinions are heard and valued.

## Relevance Check

**Budget Reduction/Service Area:**

**Service Lead:** Tammy Stokes

**Date:** 18/12/2025

In what ways does this Budget reduction have an impact on an outward facing service? How will the service feel different to your customers or potential customers?

N/A

If not, how does it impact on staff e.g. redundancies, pay grades, working conditions? Why are you confident that these staff changes will not affect the service that you provide?

N/A

Is a Customer Impact Assessment needed? No



