
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 January 2018

by Philip Lewis BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 February 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/17/3181721

12 Word Hill, Harborne, Birmingham B17 8TS

- 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 and Mrs Andrew and Bernie Broughton-Taylor against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2017/04853/PA, dated 30 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2017.
 - The development proposed was originally described as a '*two storey extension*'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side extension and alterations to existing single storey front extension at 12 Word Hill, Harborne, Birmingham B17 8TS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2017/04853/PA, dated 30 May 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Nos 2395/1; 2395/2 and 2395/L.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural matters

2. I have used the description of development given in the Council's decision notice in my decision above as it more accurately describes the development proposed than that set out in the application form.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. I saw at my site visit that there is some variety in the type and scale of dwellings on Word Hill, ranging from bungalows at the Sir Richards Drive end of the street to larger scale two storey detached dwellings towards the end of the cul de sac. Vehicular access to dwellings on Word Hill is from the rear, whilst there is path and amenity green space to the front. Opposite the Word Hill

properties across the amenity space are dwellings on The Close, which also face the amenity open space. During my site visit I noted that the layout of dwellings, other development and open space gives the area a sense of spaciousness.

5. The host dwelling sits within a relatively large plot which is appreciably wider than its neighbours on Word Hill. I note that the dwelling has been significantly extended previously and now occupies much of the width of the wide plot. The proposed two storey extension would increase the width of the dwelling within the plot by a maximum of about 2.2 metres.
6. I have taken into account that the appeal scheme would give rise to a dwelling of a scale considerably in excess of the size of the original dwelling. However, the existing dwelling, whilst being appreciably larger than its neighbours, does not sit uncomfortably within the wide plot. The proposed extensions, whilst increasing the width of the dwelling further across the plot, continue the form, lines and design of the building and are not of such a scale that they would give rise to an overly dominant dwelling given the size of the plot and retention of a gap with the neighbouring 10 Word Hill. Consequently, I do not find that the appeal scheme would give rise to an excessively sized property within the context of the street scene and would not represent an over-development of the site.
7. The proposal does not conflict with Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan January 2017 which is concerned with place making and includes amongst other things that all new development will be expected to demonstrate high design quality. The proposal also does not conflict with saved Paragraphs 3.14C-D of the Birmingham Unitary Development Plan which are concerned with design. Additionally, the appeal scheme does not conflict with the design policies of the National Planning Policy Framework. Whilst I have had regard to the Councils 'Extending your home, home extensions design guide' 2007 I do not find the proposal unacceptable.

Conditions

8. I impose conditions in respect of timescale and specifying the approved plans as that provides certainty. I also impose a condition specifying that the external building materials shall match those existing in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

9. For the above reasons and having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Philip Lewis

INSPECTOR