

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 September 2016

by Nicola Gulley MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 26 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/16/3154091
61 Booths Farm Road, Birmingham, B42 2NR

- 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 Mrs T Silva against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/03085/PA, dated 12 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of first floor side extension and hip to gable roof alterations and dormer to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development on the planning application differs from that on the appeal form. However, whilst the description on the appeal form is more detailed than that on the application form it does not materially alter the nature of the proposal. For clarity, I will determine the appeal on the basis of the appeal form.
3. Planning permission for the erection of a first floor side extension and new pitched roof at the appeal site was granted in November 2014. I note however, that the approved scheme varies from that proposed because it did not include the creation of a gabled roof structure or a rear dormer window. In view of these fundamental differences, I will afford the approved scheme limited weight in the determination of this appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a traditional semi-detached dwelling with narrow hipped roof and a single and two storey flat roof side extension located in a visually prominent position at the junction of Booths Farm Road and Foden Road. The site is enclosed on both sides and to the rear by a 1.8 metres fence and situated within a predominately residential area which contains dwellings which are, broadly, of a similar size and design.
 6. Policies 3.10 and 3.14 D of the adopted Birmingham Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (2005) make clear that new development should, amongst other things, be of a scale and design that respects the character of the surrounding area
-

and that proposals which have an adverse effect on the quality of the built environment would not normally be allowed. This approach is supported by guidance contained in the Council's adopted Home Extension Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2007).

7. In this instance the development proposes the erection of a small first floor side extension, the extension of the existing roof structure to enclose the existing and proposed extensions and the construction of a rear dormer window.
8. The Council raises no objection to the proposed first floor side extension and I agree the extension would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area.
9. With regard to the proposed alterations to the roof, whilst I note the appellants wish to create additional living accommodation, I nevertheless consider that the scale of the proposed roof extension, which would double the length of the existing structure, coupled with its gabled design would result in a discordant form of development that would fail to respect the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding properties. Furthermore, I consider that the scale of the proposed dormer window, which would occupy most of the proposed rear roof plane, would, when viewed in conjunction with the dormer window located at the rear of the adjoining property, result in a disproportionate form of development that would appear incongruous when viewed in the wider streetscene. As such I consider the proposed development would be contrary to the objectives of UDP Policies 3.10 and 3.14 D and adopted Home Extension Design Guide SPD.

Other Matters

10. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of developments in the locality which it is suggested are similar to that of the proposed. Based on the submitted evidence and my observations at the site visit, most of the recently constructed domestic extensions in the vicinity of the appeal site are of a hipped roof design and therefore respect the prevailing character of the area. With regard to 83 Booths Farm Road, whilst I note that this property has a rear dormer window, I consider that the scale of the window together with the location of the dwelling, set back significantly from the highway, would ensure that it does not have an adverse effect on the visual qualities of the area. As such I do not consider that the developments identified by the appellant directly parallel the circumstances of this case. I have in any case, determined the appeal before me on its own merits.
11. In reaching my decision I have had regard to all the matters raised in support of the scheme including that the proposed development would improve the appearance of the host dwelling. However, none of these factors are sufficient to alter my overall conclusions.
12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Gulley
INSPECTOR