
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 November 2019 by AJ Sutton BA Hons DipTP DMS MRTPI

by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/19/3236782

25 Hamstead Hill, Birmingham, B20 1BL

- 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 Rayatt against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/04445/PA, dated 24 May 2019 was refused by notice dated 22 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is single storey front extension.
-

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.

Preliminary Matter

3. The decision notice references Paragraph 3.14D of the Birmingham Plan - Birmingham Unitary Development Plan 2005 (UDP) which sets out principles against which development will be assessed, focusing on potential impacts on the local character of an area, which are not matters of dispute between the respective parties in this particular case, and therefore is not considered applicable to this decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect the development would have on the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons for Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a large suburban detached dwelling, in a substantial plot, set back and well screened from the public highway by well-established soft landscaping and a boundary wall. Similar to other properties on this side of Hamstead Hill, it has an individual character with unique design features.
6. The proposed development would provide a single storey extension to part of the principal elevation, reusing the existing bay window and introducing a sloping roof with rooflights.

7. The National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) emphasises that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development. Planning decisions should ensure that developments are visually attractive as a result of good architecture. Paragraph 130 states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area...taking into account any local design standards or style guides in plans or supplementary planning documents.
8. The host dwelling is relatively unaltered with the exception of replacement windows, discrete rooflights, a garage and apparent addition of a porch area. The proposed extension, would introduce a horizontal feature which would cut across a property which is strongly characterised by the vertical, slightly protruding gabled features, the prominence of which would be diminished by the development. In particular, the proposed sloped roof would bisect the narrower gabled protrusion, effectively framing the imposing first floor leaded window, which would significantly alter the appearance of this central original feature.
9. Furthermore, the design of the extension would not respond to the existing pattern of fenestration. The development would remove the existing alignment of the bay window with the first floor window, introduce wide and narrow rooflights, the design of which fails to take cues from the existing development, and, would replace the small central ground floor window with a larger unit which would unbalance the original design detail on this key part of the dwelling. As such the overall effect would be visually less pleasing than that which exists.
10. The proposal may indeed appear similar to developments highlighted as good practice in Extending Your Home – Home Extension Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document 2007 (SPD), however, such examples are exactly that. Each proposal must be judged on the particular individual issues and merits. Any potential benefits or proposed mitigating measures, for example the efficient use of land and the use of matching materials would neither outweigh or address the harm outlined above.
11. In light of the foregoing, I conclude that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host property in conflict with Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Plan 2031 - Birmingham Development Plan and paragraph 127 of the Framework, which collectively require development to be of a high design quality contributing to a strong sense of place with designs responding to site conditions. Consistent with saved Paragraph 3.14C of the UDP in reaching this conclusion I have had regard to the SPD and find that the proposal also conflicts with the guidance contained within this document because the new extension would not respect the appearance of the existing dwelling.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons outlined above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A J Sutton

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and concur that the appeal should be dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR