
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 November 2016

by B Bowker Mplan MRTPI

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

Decision date: 12 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/16/3157000
6 Shephard Road, Birmingham B26 3RN

- 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 Edward Lester against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/03080/PA, dated 13 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a side two storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary matter

2. On 24 November 2016 the Minister of State for Housing and Planning lifted the holding direction in relation to the Birmingham Development Plan. Comments were sought from the parties in relation to the effect of this matter on the appeal proposal. The Council are satisfied that the withdrawal of the holding direction has no effect on the appeal. Consequently, I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. No 6 Shephard Road is a semi-detached dwelling with a hipped roof design located in a residential area. Properties to the north are similar in appearance whilst the frontages of those opposite the site to the east have small centrally located gables. However, the proposal would be viewed alongside dwellings to its immediate north.
 5. The gable design, including its width and scale, would dominate and be out of character with the existing and adjoining semi-detached dwelling. Furthermore, the introduction of a gable at two storey height would be prominent and in stark contrast to the consistent and similar appearance of dwellings to the north. As the extension would be to the south side of No 6, it would be a noticeable feature from the junction of Shephard Road and Olorenshaw Road. It would also be a conspicuous and jarring feature when viewed from public vantage points along Shephard Road.
-

6. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance document entitled 'Extending your Home' seeks to ensure extensions do not dominate the appearance of the existing dwelling and fit in comfortably with the area. Paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework recognises the importance of good design in positively contributing to making places better for people. Based on my reasoning above, the proposal would fail to meet both of these requirements.
7. Therefore I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. Consequently the proposal is contrary to Saved Unitary Development Plan Policies 3.8, 3.10 and 3.14C-D which combined require development to have regard to local character, not have an adverse effect on the built environment, and protect what is good in the surrounding area.

Other matters

8. Based on the limited information before me, I am unable to fully consider the other developments referred to by the appellant. However, I note that two of the decision involved a different local planning authority the local policies requirements of which I am not aware of. Moreover, I must determine the appeal proposal before me on its own individual merits.
9. I sympathise that the proposal has been a source of concern for the appellant and his family. However, I can afford such personal circumstances limited weight only. In addition, the commencement of construction works on site has not had an effect my consideration of the appeal.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and having taken all matters raised into account, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

B Bowker

INSPECTOR