
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 June 2020

by David Troy BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/20/3246096
206 Stechford Road, Birmingham B34 6BL

- 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 Sajid Qadeer against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/09256/PA, dated 4 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of conservatory to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of conservatory to rear at 206 Stechford Road, Birmingham B34 6BL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2019/09256/PA, dated 4 November 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: 001 (Existing Layouts/Block/Location Plans) and 002 (Proposed Layouts).
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property.

Reasons

3. The appeal property consists of a two storey semi-detached dwelling with a two storey front, side and rear extension, single storey side and rear extension and dormer roof extension at the rear. It is located in a mature well-established residential area, typically characterised by two storey properties set back from the road behind a front garden/driveway.
4. I observed on my site visit that a number of the adjacent properties had single storey extensions projecting out from the rear of the buildings. The rear of the appeal property is dominated by the various extensions and alterations at the rear including a large single storey pitched roofed extension projecting approximately 5.0m from the rear and across the full width of the

house. As a result the original rhythm and harmony of the rear elevation of the property has been significantly eroded.

5. The proposed conservatory would project out about 3.6m from the rear elevation of the existing single storey extension, extending partially across the width of the house and would be set back from the boundary wall within the rear enclosed garden. The appeal property is on a relatively spacious plot and as such the conservatory would not appear overlarge, relative to the overall plot size. The conservatory with a flat glazed roof would be seen in the context of the previous extensions and the current varied architectural styles at the rear of the host property and the surrounding properties.
6. Against this backdrop, the scale, form and siting of the proposed conservatory would not look significantly out of place or excessive in relation to the built form of the host property and the adjacent properties. The modest overall scale and proportions of the conservatory together with use of matching materials and fenestrations would ensure the development would sit relatively unobtrusively against the two storey form of the host property and the existing rear extensions. The development would therefore achieve an appropriate degree of subordination to the host property and as such would not detract from the architectural integrity of the host property. In addition, the development would not be visible from the road at the front and as such would not adversely impact on the street scene in the surrounding area.
7. Consequently, I conclude that the development would not adversely harm the character and appearance of the host property. It is consistent with Saved Paragraphs 3.14C-D of the Birmingham Unitary Development Plan 2005, Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan 2017 and the Supplementary Planning Guidance - Extending Your Home 2007. These policies and guidance, amongst other things, seek to ensure that development proposals, including extensions, are of a high quality design that improve the quality of the built environment, do not dominate the appearance of the building and respect the character of the area. In addition, it would accord with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework that seeks to secure developments of a high quality of design (paragraph 124); that will add to the overall quality of the area and are sympathetic to the local character (paragraph 127).

Conditions

8. Having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework, and in particular paragraph 55, in addition to the standard time limit condition, I have specified the approved plans as this provides certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition requiring that the external surfaces of the development match those of the existing property.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Troy

INSPECTOR