
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 June 2017

by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/17/3175233

830 Coventry Road, Small Heath, Birmingham, West Midlands B10 0TZ

- 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 Mohammed Ilyas against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2017/00825/PA, dated 16 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 3 March 2017.
 - The development is a front dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. At the time of my site visit the front dormer was already in place, and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site accommodates a two-storey mid terrace house. There is some variety in the heights of the ridges and eaves of the dwellings in the terrace, reflecting local topography. Also the houses display some minor variations in design and the house at the appeal site is a prime example being rendered in white in contrast to the red brick finishes of the neighbouring properties. However the general form and scale of the houses in the terrace is consistent.
5. There are no other front dormers in the terrace within which the appeal site sits. Moreover there are no front dormers in the nearby terrace comprising Nos 794 to 826. Indeed the nearest comparable dormers in the street are at Nos 780, 782 and 784, but these are a set of three matching dormers flanked by two front gable ends which are above a distinct development of commercial units. They are a significant distance from the appeal site and do not contribute to the appeal site's immediate setting. As such the dormer at the site appears as an isolated feature, incongruous in the context of the neighbouring properties and the street scene.

6. The dormer is small in scale and the materials of its construction match those used in the remainder of the house including the tiles, colour of the window frames and detailing on the glazing. As such I do not consider the dormer appears unsympathetic with the design and character of the existing property.
7. Nonetheless, its incongruity with the street scene means it harms the character and appearance of the area. As such it fails to accord with Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan and saved paragraph 3.14D of the Birmingham Unitary Development Plan which both require development to respond to local context and character. It also conflicts with the advice in the Council's Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document, and the National Planning Policy Framework which both advise, in principle, that development should take account of the character or appearance of the area.

Conclusions

8. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all other considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR