
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 November 2019

by C Coyne BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/19/3236031

24 Hampshire Drive, Birmingham B15 3NZ

- 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 Z Jalal against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/03518/PA, dated 24 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is front two storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-story detached dwelling situated on a cul-de-sac within a predominately residential area. The existing development pattern on the street is not linear with the appeal property being set back from the adjacent dwelling to the west and set forward of the adjacent dwelling to the east. Several properties on the street have modest front porches attached to an integral side garage whilst other properties have modest dormer windows on their front elevations.
4. The proposed two-storey front extension would project a considerable distance past the front of the existing property and its ridge height would also be the same height as that of the host property. In addition to this due to its width the proposed extension would also project forward from the middle-line of the existing frontage, which would in effect give the appeal property the appearance of having a double frontage with two roof ridges.
5. As a result, the proposed extension would not be subservient to the host property or improve the appearance of the host dwelling (notwithstanding that the materials to be used would be similar to that of the host property). Consequently, given its design, massing, scale, height and width, the proposed extension would represent a discordant addition to the street scene thereby harming the character and appearance of the area with particular regard to the existing dwelling and the wider street scene.

6. I note the appellant's point that the appeal property is set well back from the adjacent dwelling no. 22 and that the other dwellings on this part of Hampshire Drive have varying designs, are staggered in terms of their layout in relation to each other and set back from the highway. However, none of the other dwellings on the street have front extensions of a scale or design similar to that which has been proposed. Moreover, the fact that the development pattern on this part of the street is not linear does not sufficiently mitigate the harm to the character and appearance of the street scene that I have identified above.
7. In support of the appeal scheme the appellant has cited the fact that the proposal would not contravene the 45 degree rule and therefore not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. However, the Council did not raise any concerns in relation to this matter and as I am dismissing the appeal on the main issue for the reasons given above, I have not pursued it further.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development conflicts with Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan (adopted January 2017), saved paragraphs 3.14C-D of the Birmingham Unitary Development Plan (adopted October 2005) and the Home Extensions Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (adopted March 2007) which promote good design and seek to ensure that new development respects, compliments and enhances local character. It would also conflict with paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires good design.

Conclusion

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

C Coyne

INSPECTOR