



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2025

by **Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G4620/D/25/3374720

7 Limes Avenue, Rowley Regis, West Midlands B65 8AZ

- 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 Addison Liew against the decision of Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application reference is DC/25/70819.
- The development proposed is described as the retention with modification of forward extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. The proposed development is largely complete. The appeal extension, as built, appears to be broadly in accordance with the plans although some differences were also evident at the site visit. Compared to the submitted drawings, the extension, as constructed, lacks a front window and the mono-pitched roof terminates just below the first-floor window, with an overhang at eaves level that is more pronounced. For the avoidance of doubt, I have assessed the proposal as it is shown on the drawings because it was on that basis that planning permission was refused.
3. Retention is not an act of development under the above Planning Act. I have assessed the proposal as one that seeks planning permission for the erection of a single storey front extension.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property forms part of a short terrace of similar 2-storey dwellings within a predominantly residential area, wherein properties vary in type and style. There are single storey front projections on other dwellings in the same terrace as No 7, and further along Limes Avenue, in the form of canopies and porches. In the main, these forward projections are modest in scale and have a light-weight appearance due to their design and the inclusion of glazing.
6. The appeal extension, as proposed, would project forward of the main front wall and span over half the width of the front elevation. It would be a sizeable addition

relative to the modest proportions of the host building. This arrangement would contrast markedly with the small canopies above the main entrances to the properties on either side of No 7. It would also noticeably differ to the modestly proportioned porch that stands centrally beneath a full width canopy at the front of the other dwelling in the same terrace as the appeal property. In that context, the proposal would appear as an overly large and bulky front extension. That impression would be most evident from Limes Avenue, just in front of the site. From this vantage point, the proposal would draw the eye as a visually disruptive and uncharacteristic addition to both the host building and the wider terrace.

7. I saw an eclectic mix of front projections to properties within the local area including those examples to which the appellant has referred and provided photographs. None of the examples cited or that I observed are directly comparable to the appeal extension in terms of design, scale and in their relationship to the host building. Therefore, I am unable to attach more than limited weight to these cases. In any event, each proposal should be assessed on its own merits. Having done so, I find that the appeal scheme would be a discordant and an unwelcome addition to the local area for the reasons given.
8. The appellant states that the porch element is only marginally above the permitted development (PD) thresholds, and that the living room extension is comparable to that of a bay projection. However, a small breach of the PD thresholds does not necessarily equate to an acceptable form of development and the appeal extension visually 'reads' as a single solid structure. Although accounting for about 35% of the total surface area of the front elevation to the existing dwelling, the visual impact of the appeal extension would be proportionally much greater.
9. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the local area. Accordingly, it conflicts with Policy ENV3 of the Black Country Core Strategy and Policy SAD EOS 9 of The Site Allocations and Delivery Development Plan Document. Together, these policies promote high quality design and note that proposals that are inappropriate in their locality will be rejected.
10. It is contrary to the guidance within the Council's Supplementary Planning Document, *Revised Residential Design Guide* (SPD). The SPD states that domestic extensions must be in proportion to the scale of the existing dwelling and the street scene. The appeal scheme is also at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) insofar as it notes that development should be sympathetic to local character and add to the overall quality of the area.
11. Overall, the proposed development conflicts with the development plan, when read as a whole. There are no material considerations, including those of the Framework, which indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.
12. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR