The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2019 by A J Sutton BA Hons DipTP DMS MRTPI

by S Ashworth BA Hons BPl MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/X/19/3226398
4 Lime Avenue, Dawlish Road, Birmingham, B29 7AH

- 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 Nick Moon against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
- The application Ref 2018/10214/PA, dated 14 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 20 February 2019.
- The development proposed is described as a 'Loft conversion'.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect that the proposed development would have on the character and appearance of the original building and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a mid-terrace dwelling in Lime Avenue. The Avenue comprises parallel terraces of properties facing a shared narrow walkway situated off Dawlish Road. The entrance is flanked by much altered dwellings (131a & 133a Dawlish Road with large flat roof dormer windows), that front Dawlish Road. The front roofs on the majority of properties within Lime Avenue are unchanged. The surrounding area is residential, principally terrace in style. Many of the properties have dormer windows which differ in design. Such additions, when situated at the front of properties, generally have hip/pitched roofs. The area is close to Birmingham University with many of the properties providing accommodation for students.

5. The proposal is for a second floor loft conversion with the addition of a flat roof dormer window, located on the front elevation, extending across the majority of the roof width of the appeal property. The dormer window would not be a sympathetic addition to the host property as the design fails to reflect the character of the property and the proposed mass would be disproportionate in comparison with the size of the existing roof, therefore it would significantly alter the appearance of this small terrace style dwelling.

6. The much-altered properties at the entrance of Lime Avenue face onto Dawlish Road, and therefore, although attached to the terraces which form the Avenue are not key to its character. Furthermore, the character of properties in Dawlish Road, and other surrounding roads, differ from those in Lime Avenue both in size and layout. There are two other examples of flat roof dormer windows situated on the front of properties in Lime Avenue. It is understood that consent was granted for a dormer window in 2016 at 1 Lime Avenue and consent was also granted with conditions for the retention of a dormer window at 7 Lime Avenue. I do not have details before me to consider these particular developments. However, it is noted that permission was refused in 2016 for a dormer window at the appeal property, the design of which appears similar to that now being proposed. In summary, proposals must be judged on their individual merits and it is concluded that this proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of Lime Avenue due to its size and architectural style, such an addition would erode the character of this quaint Avenue.

7. For the reasons outlined above this proposal would be contrary to Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan 2017, saved Paragraphs 3.14C-D of the Birmingham Unitary Development Plan 2005 and guidance set out in Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document 2007 with regards ensuring new development is of a high quality, reinforces a sense of place and local distinctiveness and is of a scale and design that respects original buildings and areas surrounding them.

Other Matters

8. Comments regarding preapplication consultation are not considered material to this appeal. The desire to improve the quality of accommodation for occupiers of the property is noted. However, there are no specific details before me and accordingly this matter does not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons outlined above, it is concluded that this appeal should be dismissed.

A J Sutton

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Susan Ashworth

INSPECTOR