



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 April 2026

by **P Brennan BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 May 2026

Appeal Ref: 6002033

53 Knottsall Lane, Oldbury B68 9LG

- 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 Baldev Virdee against the decision of Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/25/71070.
 - The development proposed is a detached dormer bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site forms part of the large front garden to the dwelling at 53 Knottsall Lane (No 53). It is occupied by various mature trees and shrubs and bordered by large hedgerows. Access to the site is proposed via the existing vehicular access to No 53. The area is residential in character with a mix of 2-storey dwellings and bungalows, many of which have rooms in the roof space.
4. The adjacent 2-storey dwellings at numbers 29 to 51 Knottsall Lane form part of a private cul-de-sac that have large front gardens and a consistent curved building line with no development to the front of the dwellings. Whilst the dwellings at numbers 53 to 57 are not accessed from the cul-de-sac, they follow the same pattern of development and have the same curved front building line as numbers 29 to 51. Due to the existing pattern of development, plot size and orientation, the appeal site is an undeveloped, verdant area in front of this group of dwellings, and therefore makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The appeal development proposes the development of the front garden area of No 53 with a 3-bedroom dormer bungalow with garage which would sever the existing plot. The bungalow would be orientated towards the access to No 53. The proposed orientation would be at odds with the orientation of the dwellings at numbers 45 to 55 Knottsall Lane which have an established pattern and orientation of development.

6. The proposed dwelling would be sited significantly forward and outside of the established front building line of the private cul-de-sac. As such, its proposed siting, would be an incongruous addition into the prevailing pattern of development, plot size, and orientation and result in the loss of a verdant area that makes a strong contribution to the area's character.
7. The existing hedgerow and trees forming the boundary treatment would partially be retained which would provide some screening of the proposal from Knottsall Lane. The remaining site area would be largely cleared of its trees and shrubs. Whilst the proposed bungalow would partially be screened from Knottsall Lane, it would be highly visible to residents and visitors of the cul-de-sac. This would lead to a development that would be inconsistent, out of place and harmful to the surrounding pattern of residential development.
8. For the above reasons, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, the proposed development would fail to accord with Policies CSP4 and ENV3 of the Black Country Core Strategy and Policy SAD EOS9 of the Site Allocations and Delivery Development Plan Document. These policies, amongst other things, require development to make a positive contribution to place making and its relationship to the street, be of high-quality design and in scale and compatible with its surroundings.

Other Matters

9. Whilst no reference is made in the Council's delegated report, the Council's policy officer has advised that No 53 is a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) due to its historic and architectural character and appearance. The National Planning Policy Framework requires, that in weighing the impact of development on the NDHA, a balanced judgement will be required, having regard to the scale of any harm and significance of the asset. Whilst the proposed dwelling would be located within the front garden of No 53, this would not harm the NDHA or its significance due to the separation distance and extent of screening retained.
10. The proposed development would be subject to the 10% Biodiversity Net Gain requirement. However, the submitted matrix, which appears to have been populated incorrectly indicates that the 10% could not be met on site without a change to the proposed scheme or the purchase of off-site credits. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, it is not necessary for me to conclude on this matter as it would not affect the outcome of this appeal. This therefore weighs neither for nor against the proposal.
11. The appellant has drawn my attention to two examples locally where further housing has been accommodated within the existing residential pattern of development. No 57 Knottsall Lane has seen development for a dormer bungalow in its rear garden. However, the dormer bungalow addresses and is accessed directly from Knottsall Lane and sits in line with the existing building line and therefore the existing pattern of development. No 2A Knottsall Lane is further away from the appeal site and has been developed for a dormer bungalow. Once again, whilst altering the plot structure locally, the development is on a similar building line to the adjacent dwellings at 2 Knottsall Lane and 332 Moat Road. It also addresses and is accessed from Knottsall Lane. In both examples, the bungalows

appear part of the original residential development plan and do not appear incongruous to their surroundings.

12. Accordingly, the properties referred to me have a different context to the appeal site and complement their local context. Therefore, there is no direct comparison to be made between these that weighs in the appeal's favour.
13. I note that the design, scale, parking, and garden area for the proposed development is not in dispute and that no objections were made against the proposal. However, an absence of harm in these respects, and absence of objection, can only be considered as neutral factors on the planning balance.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

P Brennan

INSPECTOR