

<b>Council/Committee:</b>	Planning Committee
<b>Date of Meeting</b>	03 September 2025
<b>Application Reference</b>	DC/25/70522
<b>Application Description</b>	Proposed single storey side and rear extension, front porch and outbuilding in rear garden.
<b>Application Received</b>	7 April 2025
<b>Report Author</b>	Dave Paine david_paine@sandwell.gov.uk
<b>Lead Officer</b>	Tammy Stokes
<b>Ward</b>	Greets Green and Lyng
<b>Appendices (if any)</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 4 – Location Plan</li> <li>2. 5 - Block plan</li> <li>3. 1 of 3 - Existing and Proposed Ground Floor plan</li> <li>4. 2 of 3 – Existing and Proposed Elevations</li> <li>5. 3 of 3 – Proposed Outbuilding Floor Plan and Elevations.</li> </ol>

## 1. Application Summary

- 1.1 The application is being reported to Planning Committee because 6 material planning objections have been received.
- 1.2 At your last meeting members resolved to visit the site.
- 1.3 To assist members with site context, a link to Google Maps is provided below:  
[16 Tapestries Avenue](#)

## 2. Recommendations

That planning permission is granted subject to the following conditions relating to:

- i) External materials;
- ii) Parking laid out and retained;
- iii) Drop kerb to be extended;

### **3. Reasons for the recommendation and conditions**

- 3.1 The proposal is acceptable as it has no significant impact on the amenity of the occupiers of the adjacent properties and the design and scale is appropriate to existing property and the surrounding area.

### **4. Key Considerations**

- 4.1 The site is not allocated in the development plan.
- 4.2 Material planning considerations (MPCs) are matters that can and should be taken into account when making planning decisions. By law, planning decisions should be made in accordance with the development plan unless MPCs indicate otherwise. This means that if enough MPCs weigh in favour of a development, it should be approved even if it conflicts with a local planning policy.
- 4.3 The material planning considerations which are relevant to this application are:
- Government policy (NPPF);
  - Amenity concerns – overlooking/loss of privacy, loss of light and/or outlook and overshadowing;
  - Design concerns – appearance and materials, layout of the building and wider visual amenity.

### **5. The Application Site**

- 5.1 This application relates to a linked-detached dwelling situated on the north side of Tapestries Avenue. This is a residential cul-de-sac, which was granted planning permission in 1977. The dwellings on this cul-de-sac are mostly of a similar scale and appearance, but with notable differences in design, particularly with regard to roof construction. A number of nearby dwellings have existing one and two storey extensions. The street-scene along Tapestries Avenue does not significantly slope but the overall plot of 16 Tapestries Avenue rises up towards the far end of the rear garden.

## 5.2 Planning History

Planning permission was granted for 30 new homes in 1977. A full list of the planning history is provided below:

Reference	Description	Decision and date
DC/05656	Erection of 30 dwellings and garages.	Grant Permission subject to Conditions, 05 October 1977

## 6. Application Details

- 6.1 The applicant is proposing to construct a single storey side and rear wraparound extension, a front porch and an outbuilding in the rear garden.
- 6.2 The extension would have a width of 2.4m to the side and 7.7m across the rear. The depth of the rear extension would be 4.0m and the height of the wraparound extension would 2.75m with an additional 0.5m to the apex of the pitched roof at the front. It would create an enlarged kitchen, a study, a ground floor bathroom and an additional lounge, and would result in the loss of a garage measuring (internally), 2.2m wide by 6.9m deep.
- 6.3 The proposed porch would measure 1.2m deep by 2.0m wide by 3.3m high.
- 6.4 The proposed outbuilding would measure 6.0m deep by 7.5m wide by 2.5m high.

## 7. Publicity

The application has been publicised by six neighbour notification letters. 6 objections have been received and are summarised below:

- a. The attaching of the proposed extension to the neighbouring property would create a terracing effect.
- b. The proposal would have a negative impact on the character of the street due to an increase in height, the depth of the rear extension and the forwards projection of the proposed porch.
- c. The proposed outbuilding and porch would cause a loss of privacy to neighbours.
- d. The proposal would cause a loss of light to neighbours due to the height of the extension and the depth of the extension to the rear.

Non-material objections have been raised regarding the proposed construction method.

## **8. Consultee Responses**

### **8.1 Highways**

The Highways officer noted that there would be a loss of one parking space and that the dwelling would require two parking spaces. They requested that a planning condition be applied to any approval to request that a suitable parking plan should be provided prior to commencement and should thereafter be implemented and retained.

## **9. Relevant Planning Policy Considerations**

### **9.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

The NPPF sets out government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.

#### **Design**

The framework refers to development adding to the overall quality of the area by achieving high quality design, achieving good architecture and layouts.

I am of the opinion that the scheme is of a good design and would assimilate into the overall form and layout of the site's surroundings; in accordance with the design principles of the NPPF.

#### **Highway safety**

The framework promotes sustainable transport options for development proposal and states that developments should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

### **9.2 Development Plan Policy**

The following policies of the council's development plan are relevant:

#### **Black Country Core Strategy (BCCS)**

ENV3 – Design Quality - refers to well-designed schemes that provide quality living environments. The proposed layout and design are considered to be acceptable.

#### **Site Allocations and Delivery Development Plan Document – (SADD)**

SAD EOS 9 - Urban Design Principles – the proposal is appropriate to the location in terms of scale and design.

## **10. Material Considerations**

10.1 National and local planning policy considerations have been referred to above in Sections 11 and 12. With regards to the other material considerations, these are highlighted below.

### **10.2 Amenity concerns – loss of privacy, light and outlook**

The proposed wraparound extension would not project forwards of the existing building line of the property, or its neighbour. There are no existing ground floor side windows on the neighbouring property. The rear extension would project approximately 1.0m beyond the rear walls of the existing neighbouring extensions. No part of the proposed wraparound extension would cross any 45-degree line. For these reasons, I do not consider that the wraparound extension would cause any loss of light, outlook or privacy.

The proposed porch would be similar in design and scale to the existing porch on the neighbouring property to the west. It would not cross any 45 degree line and is therefore considered acceptable in terms of loss of light and outlook. Occupants of the porch would not be afforded any views into neighbour properties which would significantly impact on privacy.

The proposed outbuilding would be positioned at the end of the garden, at a higher elevation than the rear of the building. It would have windows facing towards the rear of the property and the neighbouring properties. The General Permitted Development Order (GPDO) allows for outbuildings such as the one proposed to be built up to 2.5m high if the total built up area within the curtilage of the property would not exceed 50% and the outbuilding would be required for a purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse. I am satisfied that this proposal meets these requirements given that the intended purpose would be for storage and that the loss of the garage space would necessitate the creation of a new storage area, and that the height of the proposed outbuilding would be 2.5m when measured from ground level. Given that the outbuilding would meet the requirements of the GPDO, I consider that any potential loss of privacy caused, would not be reasonably subject to planning control.

### **10.3 Design concerns - appearance and materials, terracing effect and impact on the character of the street**

The applicant's property is currently a linked-detached dwelling with a garage to the side and is typical of the type of dwelling found on this street. The alterations would replace the garage with a side extension which would be flush with the front building line of the street. The front of the side extension

would have a window and a door. Extensions of this sort can be found at a number of properties on the street and have therefore become characteristic of the area.

The alterations to the rear would not be visible from the public realm and therefore would not impact on the character of the street. It should be noted that many properties on the street have existing rear extensions, including both neighbouring properties. A further rear extension at number 16 would not therefore be out of place in its surroundings.

Concerns relating to the creation of a terracing effect would typically relate to two-storey extensions with no set back, filling a gap between two dwellings. In this case, the side extension would be single storey and would replace the existing garage. Therefore, it is considered that no terracing effect would occur.

## **11. Conclusion**

All decisions on planning applications should be based on an objective balancing exercise. This is known as applying the 'planning balance'. To summarise: the proposal should be approved unless any adverse impacts of granting the permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against development plan policies or, where those policies are out of date, the NPPF as a whole. Where national policy takes precedence over the development plan, this has been highlighted in paragraph 9.1 (National Planning Policy Framework).

On balance the proposal accords with the provisions of relevant development plan policies and there are no significant material considerations which warrant refusal that could not be controlled by conditions.

## **12. Legal and Governance Implications**

The Planning Committee has delegated powers to determine planning applications within current Council policy. Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 gives applicants a right to appeal when they disagree with the local authority's decision on their application, or where the local authority has failed to determine the application within the statutory timeframe.

## **13. Other Relevant Implications**

None.

**14. Background Documents**

None.

**15. How does this deliver the objectives of the Strategic Themes?**

All of our residents are active participants in influencing change – through being listened to, their opinions are heard and valued.

## Relevance Check

**Budget Reduction/Service Area:** N/A

**Service Lead:** Tammy Stokes

**Date:** 13 August 2025

In what ways does this Budget reduction have an impact on an outward facing service? How will the service feel different to your customers or potential customers?

N/A

If not, how does it impact on staff e.g. redundancies, pay grades, working conditions? Why are you confident that these staff changes will not affect the service that you provide?

N/A

Is a Customer Impact Assessment needed? No