



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2025

by N Bromley BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 November 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/G4620/D/25/3371402

48 Parsons Hill, Oldbury, Sandwell B68 9BS

- 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 Arshed Saddique against the decision of Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/25/70619.
 - The development proposed is retention of 2 storey side, rear and single storey rear extension.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/G4620/D/25/3370856

50 Parsons Hill, Oldbury, Sandwell B68 9BS

- 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 Pamela Brazier against the decision of Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/25/70456.
 - The development proposed is retention of two storey side/rear and single storey rear extensions and front porch.
-

Decision

Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The two appeals in the banner heading above relate to a pair of semi-detached dwellings. The description of development for both appeals is broadly the same and they raise the same issues. Therefore, although they are two separate appeals, I have considered both appeals in a single decision letter to avoid repetition. However, I have considered each development on its individual merits.
4. For Appeal B, I have used the description of development taken from the Council's decision notice and the appeal form, as opposed to the application form, as it more accurately describes that for which permission is sought. I have also excluded superfluous information that is not an act of development.
5. I have assessed each appeal scheme based on the plans before me, but I observed at the time of the site visit that the external works of each development

were largely complete. Therefore, each development is retrospective. I have dealt with each appeal on that basis.

6. I note that an Enforcement Notice for each property has been served by the Council, and an appeal has been lodged against each. However, it is not within my remit to comment upon the likely outcome of the Enforcement Notice appeals.

Main Issue

7. The main issue in both Appeal A and B is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

8. 48 and 50 Parsons Hill are a pair of two-storey, semi-detached dwellings, set within a row of residential properties that front the road. The two properties each have a frontage parking area, and a sizeable rear garden.
9. The street scene is characterised by modest, two storey semi-detached houses that extend along both sides of the road. There are two distinct house types along the road, largely of a similar scale, with a consistent front building line, and set within uniform plots. Some of the properties have single storey side extensions but equally many others preserve a small gap to the side, and the houses largely retain their original appearance. As such, there is uniformity along the road.
10. The side extension to 48 Parsons Hill, with a two-storey height, built up to the side boundary and with no set back from the front elevation, or break in the ridgeline, overwhelms the host property. Indeed, its scale, form and appearance is not subordinate to the design of the original dwelling. Furthermore, the side extension is slightly set forward which portrays an appearance of a continuous front building line. In combination with a minimal separation to the side, the extension appears cramped and inharmonious, and the house is significantly at odds with the modest scale and design of neighbouring properties. As such, the appearance of the extension is incongruous.
11. In addition, with no set back or break in the ridgeline, and built up to the side boundary, the two-storey side extension results in an unacceptable terracing effect, and the house sits uncomfortably within the more uniform semi-detached dwellings along the road.
12. Likewise, and for similar reasons to those set out for Appeal A, with no set back or break in the ridgeline, the two-storey side extension to 50 Parsons Hill (No 50), which is built up to the side boundary and with a seamless front building line at first floor, is not a subservient extension. Instead, it is a dominant extension that is harmful to the character of the original dwelling.
13. Built up close to the side boundary, the side extension to No 50 also significantly reduces the gap between the neighbouring property. In combination with the lack of a set back or break in the ridgeline, the extension contributes to an unacceptable terracing effect within the street scene. It therefore represents an incongruous extension to the host dwelling and is also discordant within the area.
14. Even if I had considered the cumulative harm of the two extensions together, I would have found that the symmetrical appearance of the two extensions, with an unacceptable form, size and appearance, does not represent good design.

15. Both properties benefit from extant planning permissions and while I have determined each appeal on its own merits, I have considered the claimed fallback position for both Appeal A and Appeal B in my planning balance.
16. My attention has been drawn to other examples of residential extensions in the area, which I observed during my site visit. The examples included first floor and two storey side extensions to both detached and semi-detached dwellings. However, the notable difference between the large majority of the examples and the appeal schemes is that many of the extensions to semi-detached properties have been set back from the front elevation of the original dwelling, which also achieves a natural break in the ridgeline. The two appeal schemes do not include such design features.
17. There is no question that two storey side extensions could be acceptable in principle in this area, as illustrated by the extant planning permissions for two storey side extensions at each property. Inevitably, it is the detail and specific context of any development which determines whether it is acceptable in practice. Having considered the size, location and design of the two appeal schemes, and the effect on the character and appearance of each host property and this area, for the reasons given, I consider that there is unacceptable harm. Given this, the other highlighted examples do not add weight in favour of each development. Accordingly, as I am required to do, I have determined each case before me on its own merits.
18. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the developments subject of both Appeal A and Appeal B harm the character and appearance of each host property and the area. Therefore, the developments are contrary to Policies HOU2, CSP4 and ENV3 of the Black Country Core Strategy (2011), and Policy SAD EOS9 of the Site Allocations and Delivery Development Plan Document (2012). These together and amongst other things seek to ensure that development is of a high-quality design and compatible with their surroundings.

Other Matters

19. Appeal A benefits from an extant planning permission¹ for proposed single and two storey side and rear extensions. Likewise, Appeal B benefits from two previous, extant planning permissions² for proposed two / single storey side / rear extensions with new front porch and alterations to front canopy. A copy of the approved plans for each of the extant planning permissions has been submitted.
20. In the event that each appeal is dismissed, I consider that there is a greater than theoretical possibility that the works approved under the extant permissions might take place. Accordingly, this represents a fallback position and is a significant material consideration.
21. The difference between the extant planning permissions and the developments subject of both Appeal A and Appeal B is that the proposed extensions previously permitted have been set back at first floor on the front elevation of each property, which also results in an extension with a lower ridge height than that of each main dwelling. The set back and lower ridge height of each proposed extension would be noticeable. As a result, the extant planning permissions for each property

¹ Council reference: DC/23/67996

² Council reference: DC/23/68291 and DC/24/69086

achieve a subordinate and acceptable design that would also avoid an unacceptable terracing effect. Consequently, the fallback position for both Appeal A and Appeal B would have a markedly lesser effect on the character and appearance of each host property and the area than the two appeal schemes. The fallback position for both Appeal A and Appeal B would therefore be preferable and consequently receives limited weight in the determination of each appeal.

22. The appellant for each appeal suggests that the extensions provide for meaningful first floor accommodation that allows for the proper functioning of the bedrooms including the coordinated distribution of furniture. Nonetheless, the weight attached to these matters, including the fallback position and the acceptability of other elements of each scheme, particularly those at the rear, would not outweigh the harm caused by the impact that both Appeal A and Appeal B have on the character and appearance of each host property and the area.

Conclusion

23. For the reasons given above, I conclude that Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

N Bromley

INSPECTOR