Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2026

by Eleni Marshall BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 February 2026

Appeal Ref: 6003583
27 New Hope Road, Sandwell, Smethwick, B66 3TX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Ata Tarakhel against Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council.
- The application Ref is DC/25/70852.
- The development proposed is proposed single storey rear extension, loft conversion, front porch and outbuilding to rear.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have utilised the Council's description of the proposal as I find it describes the proposal more concisely.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon neighbouring residential amenity with regard to loss of light and outlook.

Reasons

4. There are several elements to the appeal proposal as noted from the development description above, however, the refusal reason stated by the Council is clear in its reference to being based upon the single storey rear extension only. The Council's delegated report confirms that the proposed loft conversion, front porch and outbuilding to the rear do not raise any significant concerns regarding impact on light, outlook or privacy and that their massing and scale would be proportionate to the existing dwelling. Furthermore, no concerns are raised in relation to impact on the character of the existing property or the visual amenity of the wider area. Based upon the evidence before me, and my site visit, I have no reason to conclude differently with regard to those elements so, for the avoidance of doubt, this appeal will focus upon the proposed single storey rear extension in the context of the main issue noted above.

5. The appeal site is a mid-terraced property which stands within a residential area. The built form in the locality is characterised by uniform rows of dwellings which, in the case of New Hope Road, have rear elevations facing to a central point with the exception of the flatted development to the South. The nature of the properties results in relatively narrow, uniform, gardens which match the width of the respective host dwellings to the rear as can be seen from walkways within the centre of site. The proposed single storey rear extension would be in the region of

3.4 metres in height (2.6 metres to the eaves) and 4 metres in length extending the full width of the host dwelling – i.e. immediately along the shared neighbouring boundaries.

6. As can be seen, from the proposed plans, the proposed extension would extend beyond the rear elevation of the host dwelling, and therefore the rear elevations of the properties either side, by 4 metres which I find would be inappropriate in terms of impact on light and outlook to the neighbouring properties either side. This is due to the height and depth of the proposal in such close proximity to the rear elevations of the neighbouring properties and, in turn, habitable windows notwithstanding the presence of the boundary fencing (which the proposal would exceed the height of even at the lowest point, the eaves, on the boundary).

7. It is noted that it has been stated, by the appellant, that occupiers of neighbouring properties have been engaged in the process, and it is noted that there are no objections to the scheme, but a lack of objection is a neutral consideration. Even though this may be the case, in considering the proposal, I am still of the conclusion that the proposal would have a significantly detrimental impact on the current and future occupiers of the neighbouring properties in respect of loss of light and outlook. The impact on future occupiers, beyond those currently in the respective properties, is a material consideration.

8. I am mindful as to the appellant's statement outlining the need for the extension, however, whilst the appellant's requirements have been taken into account within my consideration of this proposal they do not, unfortunately, outweigh the unacceptable, appreciable, loss of light and outlook to neighbouring properties. I also acknowledge that the appellant has offered to reduce the length of the proposal to 3 metres from the rear elevation. However, in this case it is necessary that I determine the appeal on the basis of the plans that were considered by the Council at planning application stage. The appellant's indication that they could reduce the length of the development suggests, at the very least, that it would be possible to achieve accommodation improvements whilst at the same time having a potentially less severe impact in terms of living conditions.

9. The proposal would be contrary to Black Country Core Strategy 2011 Policy ENV3 which requires proposals to strive for the highest possible design standards, good placemaking and sustainable development given local circumstances and the Site Allocations and Delivery Development Plan Document 2012 Policy EOS 9 which seeks to reject proposals that are incompatible with their surroundings. The proposal would also be contrary to the guidance set out within the Revised Residential Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2014 which seeks to resist domestic extensions which are clearly out of keeping with their surroundings by virtue of their scale and impact on neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Eleni Marshall

INSPECTOR