



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 July 2019 by S Watson BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/W/19/3228116

1147-1149 Alcester Road South, Billesley, Birmingham, B14 5TP

- 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 Dhir against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/01316/PA, dated 14 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 April 2019.
 - The development proposed was described as 'elevational alterations to front of Alcester Road South and side elevations to Arundel Road, including new ground floor bay to front and bay feature on corner with Arundel Road with landscaping forecourt to property to Alcester Road South'.
-

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 Council's decision notice makes it clear that its concern relates to the two-storey bay feature proposed. Accordingly, the main issue in this case is the effect of this bay window extension on the character and appearance of the existing property and area, by way of its design.

Reason for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is located on a corner plot at the junction between Alcester Road South and Arundel Road and contains a detached property which fronts onto Alcester Road South. The ground floor has most recently been used as a shop, however approval has recently been granted¹ for conversion of the property to a dwelling and removal of the shop front. The surrounding area is characterised by residential properties which have front two-storey bay window features and hipped roofs. Although the appeal property does not have a bay window feature, it shares similar design characteristics with the wider area such as a hipped roof and external materials.

¹ Birmingham City Council Ref: 2018/04336/PA

5. Sited to the front of the dwelling, the new bay window would, as a result of its depth, scale and design be a prominent feature which would be incongruous with the flat and relatively simple design of the existing front elevation. Rather than providing a sense of unity, the two-storey bay window would be an awkward and disproportionate addition to the host property, which would be harmful to its character and appearance. It would not be an innovative design as asserted by the appellant.
6. It follows that the contribution the appeal property would make to the character and appearance of the street scene would be significantly diminished as a result of this element of the proposal. The extended property would be out of scale and character with the simple bay windows serving nearby properties, and would result in an alien feature in the street scene, the harm of which would be exacerbated by the property's prominent corner location. Harm to the character and appearance of the area would occur as a result.
7. Whilst other elements of the proposal would be likely to enhance the character and appearance of the host property and area in general, including the landscaping of the forecourt and the removal of the external staircase, these matters would not mitigate the harm identified. I note the appellant's assertion of the difficulty that would arise to convert the building to a dwelling and that he does not wish to carry out the approved scheme. These matters however carry limited weight in my consideration of the proposal as it is likely that there are alternative design approaches which could be considered to achieve suitable residential accommodation.
8. In light of the above I conclude that the two-storey bay window extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing property and the area, in conflict with Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Plan 2031: Birmingham Development Plan and saved Paragraphs 3.14C-D of the Birmingham Unitary Development Plan 2005, as well as the guidance contained within the Places for Living Supplementary Planning Guidance, which amongst other things, collectively seek development to demonstrate high design quality and contribute to a strong sense of place. There would also be conflict with Chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which relates to achieving well-designed places.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. For the reasons given above I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Watson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and concur that the appeal should be dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR