



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2026

by **E Pickernell BSc MSC MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 January 2026

Appeal Ref: 6001669

1 Charlemont Road, West Bromwich, Sandwell B71 3HX

- 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 Pradeep Singh against the decision of Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/25/70838.
 - The development proposed is porch extension, garage first floor extension and internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area; and
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties in respect of privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property comprises a detached property located on a prominent plot near to the junction of Charlemont Road and Walsall Road. The surrounding area is characterised by a variety of building styles and forms. However, the linear layout and relatively consistent building line provide a degree of regularity to the character and appearance of the area.
4. Although the appeal property is not listed nor located in a Conservation Area, it is of a traditional style and proportions. It's north elevation in particular exhibits classical features such as linear eaves mouldings, window headers, door surround and sash-style windows. To the south, the appeal property has a single storey flat roof garage, linked to the host dwelling, which extends to the southern boundary of the site. The low height of these elements provides visual relief and a sense of space around the host dwelling. As such the appeal property is an attractive, prominently located dwelling which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. It is proposed to construct a two-storey porch on the north elevation of the property. The extension would extend from the eaves and ridge of the main dwelling and would have a front facing gable. Even though it would be relatively

modest in terms of its footprint it would conflict and compete with the characteristic eaves and roof form and would interrupt the strong horizontal emphasis these provide to the existing dwelling. Furthermore, the size of the window would fail to reflect the existing hierarchy and balance of fenestration within the existing building. As a result, the porch extension would appear jarring and incongruous in this context and would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the contribution it makes to the area.

6. It is also proposed to extend on top of the flat roof of the existing garage to provide a room at first floor. Whilst a single storey element would remain between the extension and the host dwelling, the proposal would erode the sense of space around the building by introducing first floor development to the south of the building in very close proximity to both the host dwelling and the existing dwelling to the south of the appeal site. As a result, the proposal would appear cramped in the plot.
7. The proposed extension would be visible in views towards the appeal site from public vantage points on Charlemont Road and Walsall Road, as it would sit forward of the west elevation of the host dwelling. As a result of the truncated roof, the first-floor extension would appear unresolved and incongruous. In this context it would jar with the proportions and design of the host dwelling and other buildings in the area.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. It would conflict with Policies ENV3 of the Black Country Core Strategy (adopted February 2011) (BCCS) and Policy SAD EOS9 of the Site Allocations and Delivery Development Plan Document (Adopted December 2012) (SADDPD). Together these seek to ensure that development proposals achieve a high standard of design which responds appropriately to its surroundings.

Living conditions

9. The proposed first floor extension would involve the provision of roof light windows on the rear roof slope. These would face in the direction of the neighbouring property to the east and would be adjacent to the property which adjoins to the south.
10. The plans indicate that the bottom edge of the roof lights would be below 1.5m above floor level and as such views out of them would be possible. However, the angle of the roof would lessen the impact of this by limiting downward views. Furthermore, the relationship between the roof lights and neighbouring gardens would be similar to that which already exists between the neighbouring gardens and existing first floor windows at other properties, given the relatively dense urban context. As such any increase in overlooking would be minor and would not have a significant impact upon the privacy of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not result in a harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties in respect of privacy. In this regard the proposal would accord with Policies ENV3 of the BCCS and SAD EOS9 of the SADDPD insofar as they seek to ensure that development is compatible with its surroundings.

Conclusion

12. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations, which indicate that the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

E Pickernell

INSPECTOR