
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2020 by A J Sutton BA Hons DipTP DMS MRTPI

by Sarah Housden BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/19/3241200

167 Southgate Road, Birmingham, B44 9AH

- 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 Babul Islam against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/06156/PA, dated 19 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is a 'double storey side and rear 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 main issue is the effect of the proposal on the appearance of the host dwelling and on the character of the area.

Reasons for Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling within an established residential area of similar style properties. It occupies a corner plot at the junction of Fairbourne Avenue and Southgate Road. Although it is set back slightly from the prevailing building line in the street, and is distinguished by its rendered finish, its modest proportions are in keeping with the surrounding grain of development and built form, and as such, the character of the area.
5. The proposed two storey side and rear extension would double the size of the host dwelling, with the ground floor set slightly forward of the existing building line of the principal elevation to form a bay window to match the existing window, with a front door to be positioned centrally.
6. The National Planning Policy Framework (the 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.

7. The design of the proposed extension seeks to reflect some of the features of the existing dwelling. However, due to its width, depth and overall bulk, the proposed extension would not be subordinate in scale or appearance to the host dwelling and would unbalance the form of the semi-detached pair. The proposed extension would have a similar ridge height to the existing dwelling and this together with the minimal set back from the existing front wall would mean that the original form and modest proportions of the host dwelling would be lost. Due to the corner location and its position forward of the building line on Fairbourne Avenue, the proposed extension would have an imposing and unduly dominant appearance when viewed from both Fairbourne Avenue and Southgate Road.
8. The other extensions in the area referred to by the appellant, with roof ridges matching the original dwelling and not set back from the original front elevation, are noted but I have not been provided with any further details of those developments. I observed on the site visit that properties in the immediate area of the appeal site are relatively unaltered and that the general character of the area comprised modest sized semi-detached dwellings which have not been significantly extended, with correspondingly proportionate garden spaces. Whilst I have had regard to the examples identified, I have judged the case before me on its own merits.
9. I note the appellant's willingness to accommodate the Council's initial suggested changes to the proposal during the application stage. I have, however, assessed the submitted scheme based on the circumstances of the site and the effect of the proposal on the host property and surrounding area.
10. I note, also, that there have been some discrepancies in the measurement of the distance between the side wall of the proposed extension and the common boundary with Fairbourne Avenue. Whilst the area is characterised by dwellings positioned close to side boundaries and there would be adequate separation distance between the side wall of the extension and Fairbourne Avenue boundary, this would not mitigate the visual impact of the proposed extension in this open corner location which would be harmful to the character of the surrounding area.
11. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude in relation to the main issue that due to its scale and bulk, the proposed extension would be a dominant and incongruous feature and would harm the appearance of the host dwelling and the character of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan 2017, Paragraph 3.14D of the Birmingham Unitary Development Plan 2005 (UDP) and the Framework which collectively require development of a high design quality contributing to a sense of place, with scale and design respecting the surrounding area and reinforcing local distinctiveness.
12. Paragraph 3.14C of the UDP requires, when considering proposals, to have regard to relevant supplementary planning documents. The development would also be contrary to guidance set out in Extending Your Home - Home Extensions Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2007 which seeks development that respects the appearance of the local area with side

extensions smaller than the main part of the house and that do not dominate its appearance.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. 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

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

Sarah Housden

INSPECTOR