
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 May 2020

by M Shrigley BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/20/3246000

443, City Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham, Warwickshire B17 8LD

- 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 B Singh against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/05696/PA, dated 14 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is for a "single storey rear extension to existing dwelling house to form storage area and w.c. to rear of existing garage".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The description of the development on the appellant's submitted appeal form and the Council's Decision Notice is "the erection of first-floor side and single storey rear extensions". This description more accurately describes the proposal in accordance with the submitted plans. My decision is based on the submitted plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a large detached dwelling situated on a corner plot. Surrounding residential properties are predominantly semi-detached, varying in appearance with their front elevations uniformly set back from the highway.
5. I note the Council's objections relate only to the first-floor extension therefore, I have focused on this aspect of the proposed development.
6. Factoring that the host dwelling has been previously extended, its overall frontage width is already markedly larger than that of other nearby dwellings situated on this part of City Road. The additional size and mass of the extension would, as a result, significantly exacerbate the prominence of the overall frontage width of the host dwelling at first-floor level. In doing so it would be viewed from pedestrian approaches as an incongruous addition, relative to the frontage widths of other narrower properties in the row. Despite

the use of sympathetic materials and a lower roof ridge, the bulk of the extension would be dominant and prominent in this context.

7. I appreciate that the footprint of the host dwelling already abuts the highway verge on the side of Bernard Road. However, the additional storey proposed on top of that would be a significant change to the appearance of the dwelling. Moreover, the height, width and depth of the proposed extension (the depth some 8.8 metres, facing onto Bernard Road) would materially reduce important separation space observed between the dwelling and the highway at first-floor level. The reduction in spaciousness evident would be noticeable and taken up by the strident appearance of the extension when seen from public vantages toward the road junction.
8. The proposed first-floor side extension would be visible as an incongruous and unduly dominant addition. Furthermore, it would significantly reduce important first-floor separation space between the dwelling and highway in the context of the host dwelling's corner plot position.
9. I therefore conclude that the development, as proposed, would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan 2017 which requires new development to demonstrate high design quality, contributing to a strong sense of place by reinforcing local distinctiveness and the local area context. It also conflicts with Paragraph 3.14C-D of the Birmingham Unitary Development Plan 2005 and the aims of Supplementary Planning Guidance "Places for All" and "Places for Living" which in combination seek that development respects local character, as well as Paragraph 127 (a) of the National Planning Policy Framework which advises that the development should add to the overall quality of an area.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

M Shrigley

INSPECTOR