



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 October 2025

by **S Sharp BSc(Hons) BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/G4620/D/25/3372261

58 Queslett Road, Birmingham B43 6PH

- 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 Ms Lina Begum against the decision of Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application reference is DC/25/70494.
 - The development proposed was originally described as “single storey front extension and boundary wall”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey front/side extension and front porch at 58 Queslett Road, Birmingham B43 6PH, in accordance with the terms of the application reference DC/25/70494, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos: 2025_18_01 Rev B Existing Plans and Elevations; 2025_18_02 Rev B Proposed Plans; 2025_18_03 Rev B Proposed Elevations.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development on the application form includes a boundary wall. During consideration of the application by the Local Planning Authority, the wall was deleted from the proposal. At the same time, amended plans were submitted for the extension. An amended description was agreed at this time.
3. The development described on the Local Planning Authority’s decision notice is: “Proposed single storey front/side extension and front porch”. I have therefore based my decision on the amended plans and revised description which I have adopted in my formal decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The host dwelling is a 2 storey semi-detached house located within an established, predominantly residential, suburban area. It is situated within a row of semi-detached dwellings which would originally have been similar in style and design,

but many have been altered and extended at the front. The variety of extensions and alterations means that no one pair of semi-detached dwellings are the same, and nor are any of the pairs symmetrical in appearance when viewed from Queslett Road.

6. The proposal involves a single storey pitched roof extension which would extend across the width of the front elevation and include a porch extending approximately 4.3 metres from the main front elevation of the host dwelling. This would result in it still being approximately 14 metres from the public highway. A pitched roof would be introduced to an existing flat roof at the side of the host dwelling.
7. The proposal would reference the characteristics and appearance of some of the existing extensions within the row, including the combination of gabled and hipped roofs, approximate height, and a staggered front elevation. It would also be subservient overall to the host 2 storey dwelling, the massing further reduced by the disaggregated form.
8. The projection would appear to be greater than other additions in the row. However, because of the significant depth of the front garden and the fact that approximately half of this projection would be limited to the modest porch element, there would be no resultant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area or on the host dwelling itself. The proposal would fit in visually and be in keeping with its surroundings.
9. I therefore find that the proposal would accord with policy ENV3 of the Black Country Core Strategy 2011. This policy advises that successful place making depends on understanding and responding to the identity of each place with high quality design proposals. I also find accordance with policy SAD EOS 9 of the Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council's Site Allocations and Delivery Development Plan Document 2012. This seeks to reject poor designs, particularly those that are inappropriate in their locality, and that particular regard will be paid to how developments relate to the street.

Other Matters

10. I have had regard to representations from interested parties expressing concerns about the impact on living conditions. However, these appear to predate the submission of the amended plans which lessen the forward projection of the proposed front extension. As a result of these changes, the outlook and levels of natural light in the nearest front rooms of adjacent dwellings would be acceptable. Concerns raised with regard to the boundary wall are also no longer relevant as this element no longer forms part of the proposal.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty.
12. The plans include an annotation that materials will match those used on the host dwelling, so a condition relating to these details is not necessary.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, having considered the development plan as a whole and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is allowed.

S Sharp

INSPECTOR