



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 March 2026 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 May 2026

Appeal Ref: 6002966

7 Junction Street, Oldbury, West Midlands B69 3HD

- 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 Jagjit Singh against the decision of Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/25/70953.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The development has already been partly implemented, and I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - i) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area;
 - ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties, in terms of outlook, daylight and sunlight; and
 - iii) the living conditions of the occupiers of the appeal property, in terms of garden space.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in a mixed-use area. It is situated at the corner of Junction Street and Dudley Road, where I observed on my site visit that the rear extension is visible from the public realm. The main part of the dwelling has a dual-pitched roof, and it has existing single storey side and rear extensions which also have pitched roofs. Notwithstanding the single storey rear extension subject of this appeal, with its pitched roof forms and

facing brickwork, the overall appearance of the host dwelling is generally commensurate with the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

6. I have had regard of the guidance in the Council's Revised Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2014) (SPD). This advises that poor quality domestic extensions that do not fit in visually or are clearly out of keeping with their surroundings, by virtue of their scale, architectural design, materials and impact on neighbouring properties will be resisted.
7. As a result of the notable scale and mass of the single storey rear extension, it appears as a bulky and unsympathetic addition to the host dwelling. In design terms, the flat roof form fails to integrate with the pitched roof forms found elsewhere at the dwelling. Furthermore, and despite the materials listed on the application form, the grey render of the extension's external walls visually jars with the red brickwork of the host dwelling and those in the locality. Even though the extension is located to the rear of the dwelling, it is nevertheless visible above the fence line when viewed from Dudley Road, so much so that it appears discordant in the street scene. Overall, the extension is an incongruous addition to the appeal property and is harmful to the appearance of the surroundings.
8. Consequently, the development is harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It conflicts with Policy ENV3 of the Black Country Core Strategy (2011) (BCCS) and Policy SAD EOS 9 of the Site Allocations and Delivery Development Plan Document (2012) (DPD), which amongst other matters, require that developments deliver high quality design which are appropriate in their locality.
9. For the same reasons, the development conflicts with the guidance in the SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which amongst other matters, seek high quality design which adds to the overall quality of the area.

Living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties

10. There is little evidence before me of where the nearest windows on the rear elevations of the neighbouring properties are located. Furthermore, given that the single storey rear extension occupies all of the area to the rear of the host dwelling, I was unable to locate the windows at the neighbouring properties on my site visit. Despite this, habitable windows on rear elevations of the surrounding dwellings are common and there is nothing before me to suggest that there are no habitable windows on the rear elevations of the neighbouring properties. It is therefore a reasonable assumption that the rear elevations of the neighbouring properties contain habitable room windows.
11. The site plan shows that the single storey rear extension is sited close to the rear elevation of 21 Dudley Road (no 21). Its height is also notably taller than the height of the boundary fence between the properties. Therefore, the extension would appear as an obvious and overbearing feature when viewed by occupiers of any habitable rooms on the rear elevation of no 21, to the detriment of their outlook. For the same reasons, it would result in a reduction of ambient daylight to habitable rooms on the rear elevation of no 21.
12. With regards to the effect of the single storey rear extension on sunlight to no 21, the site plan demonstrates that the extension is sited to the northwest of the rear elevation of no 21. Due to this orientation, it is unlikely to result in any significant

- reduction of direct sunlight to habitable rooms located on the rear elevation of no 21 which the windows serve.
13. The other neighbouring property is the adjoining semi-detached dwelling. The site plan shows that the depth of the single storey rear extension projects far beyond the rear elevation of the adjoining semi-detached dwelling and that it is sited immediately adjacent to the boundary. Furthermore, given the notable height of the extension, it is likely to be taller than any boundary treatment between the properties. Consequently, the extension would appear as a conspicuous and overbearing feature when viewed by occupiers of any habitable rooms on the rear elevation of the adjoining property, to the detriment of their outlook.
 14. Furthermore, the site plan also shows that the single storey rear extension is sited to the southeast of the rear elevation of the adjoining semi-detached dwelling. Consequently, the extension would result in a reduction of direct sunlight to any habitable windows on the rear elevation of the adjoining property, particularly during the morning hours. Moreover, due to the overall scale of the extension and its proximity to the boundary, it would result in a reduction of ambient daylight to the rooms and as such, the experience of any users of the room.
 15. Although the appellant states that the extension does not intersect the 45-degree sightlines from principal rear facing windows of the neighbouring properties, they have not provided any detailed plans to that extent. In any case, and based on the evidence before me, I find this inconceivable based on the siting of the extension and its relationship with the neighbouring properties, as is depicted on the site plan.
 16. For the above reasons, the development is harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties, in terms of outlook, daylight and sunlight. It conflicts with Policies ENV3 of the BCCS and SAD EOS 9 of the DPD, insofar as they require that developments contribute to good place making, are appropriate in the locality and are compatible with their surroundings.
 17. The development also conflicts with the guidance in the SPD and the Framework, insofar as they seek developments that do not unduly impact on neighbouring properties and that they should provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Living conditions of occupiers of the appeal property

18. Despite the presence of the existing extensions, as well as the single storey rear extension subject of this appeal, there remains a sizeable garden area to the side of the dwelling. This space is predominantly open and paved. It could be used for outdoor purposes such as sitting out, children playing and drying clothes. Therefore, although the single storey rear extension has reduced the amount of garden space at the site, it is not entirely devoid of suitable space for typical outdoor activities.
19. For these reasons, the development is not harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of the appeal property, in terms of the garden size. On this main issue, the development complies with Policies ENV3 of the BCCS and SAD EOS 9 of the DPD, insofar as they require that developments contribute to good place making.
20. On this main issue, the development also complies with the guidance in the SPD and the Framework, insofar as they seek developments which provide adequate

amenity space for residents and a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Other Matters

21. Even if the development creates employment for local builders and tradespeople which in turn contributes to the local economy, this is of a limited benefit given the extent of the development. I also note the intent of the appellant in terms of investing in the property and providing additional space for the occupants. However, such personal circumstances seldom outweigh general planning considerations. Overall, the benefits put forward by the appellant are not sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified.
22. The absence of harm in terms of ecology, highway safety, parking and neighbour privacy are neutral factors which do not weigh in favour of the appeal. Furthermore, although the appellant indicates that they would be willing to accept conditions if the appeal were granted, no suggested conditions have been put forward by the appellant. Similarly, I see no such conditions which would make this development acceptable.

Conclusion and Recommendation

23. The proposed development would be contrary to the development plan as a whole and there are no other identified considerations which would outweigh this conflict. Therefore, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

24. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR