



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 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 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/19/3234653

22 Conway Avenue, Quinton, Birmingham B32 1DR

- 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 Sihra against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/02843/PA, undated, was refused by notice dated 2 July 2019.
 - The development is proposed single storey rear extension and 2 storey side 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.

Main Issue

3. The Council's decision notice makes it clear that its concern relates to the first-floor side extension. Accordingly, the main issue in this case is the effect of this side extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, by way of its design.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached, two storey dwelling located at the corner of this 'L' shaped cul-de-sac. A public footpath runs along the side boundary of the site.
5. The boundary of the property is such that it splays towards the rear of the site. Because of this, the front elevation of the garage to the side of the property is narrower than its rear elevation. However, within the street scene, this is not readily apparent because of the scale and design of the garage.
6. The proposed side extension would be constructed in a similar position to the existing garage and utility area. It would however be of a much larger scale, with a tall blank wall facing towards the footpath to the side of the site, and would as a result of its wedge shape, splayed roof design, and fenestration result in a prominent, incongruous addition which would detract from, and would not reflect the simple square form of the existing dwelling.
7. I acknowledge that there is no dispute over the size of the new extension relative to the host dwelling and that the appellants have designed the proposal

to make best use of the shape of the site, however these matters do not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

8. My attention has been drawn to a number of extensions in the locality. However, I do not have sufficient information before me relating to the circumstances of these cases to assess whether they are directly comparable to the proposal before me. Nevertheless, all proposals need to be considered on their own merit.
9. I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling in conflict with Policy PG3 of *the Birmingham Plan 2031: Birmingham Development Plan*, saved Paragraphs 3.14C and 3.14D of *The Birmingham Plan: Birmingham Unitary Development Plan 2005*, the guidance contained within the *Extending your Home: Home Extensions Design Guide* supplementary planning document and Paragraph 127 of the *National Planning Policy Framework*. Collectively these policies and guidance seek for development to be of a high quality design which is visually attractive and respects the appearance of the existing dwelling.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

S Watson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. 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