
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 July 2020

by M Shrigley BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/20/3249457

312 Longbridge Lane, Northfield, Birmingham B31 4TS

- 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 Richard Hendrickson against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/09479/PA, dated 14 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 19 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The Council have stated that plan revisions post the plans received labelled by the appellant as "Rev B" in email correspondence comprising of plan drawing I.D reference numbers A.01.04 and A.01.03 were not accepted by them for consideration, owing to public consultation requirements. Therefore, my decision is based only on the plans registered with the planning application up to "Rev B". This is also because the further plan revisions beyond those specified as being determined by the Council include a different form of development which would prejudice other parties and the basis of the appeal if considered as they have not been subject to a consultation procedure.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street-scene.

Reasons

4. The host property is semi-detached and occupies a corner plot adjacent to a cul-de-sac. Properties in the vicinity are similar in appearance and size, with brick and render elevations.
5. The proposed side extension would increase the frontage width of the appeal dwelling by over double its current width. This would look disproportionate to the original proportions of the host dwelling. Owing to the position and dimensions of the extension it would result in the appeal property having a lopsided appearance which would be overly dominant and incongruous. The effect would be and harmful to the character and appearance of the property.

6. Furthermore, for the above reasons, the resultant dwelling would also be incompatible with the proportions of neighbouring dwellings forming the immediate street-scene including the adjoining semi. The bulk and mass of the extension would take up important corner separation space between the dwelling and the highway beyond an established building line. The effect would be prominent within the wider street-scene and erode from the character of the area.
7. I acknowledge that the use of external rendering and a gable roof would match the main dwelling and other properties within the street-scene is proposed but those factors would not overcome my other concerns. The appellant also refers to a variety of other extensions in the wider area to support the merits of his case. However, those examples are a considerable distance from the appeal property and in any event the presence of similar additions would not justify allowing further harm.
8. I therefore conclude that the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the main dwelling house as well as the street-scene. 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 is also conflicts with Paragraph 3.14C-D of the Birmingham Unitary Development Plan 2005 and the aims of "Extending Your Home, Home Extensions Design Guide" Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2007 which all encourage good design, 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.

Other Matters

9. I note that the extension is required for the appellant's family accommodation needs and home security provision. However, these considerations do not outweigh the harm I have identified.
10. The appellant has also referred to negotiations with the Council on other amended plan proposals, but I can only consider the plans before me.

Conclusion

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

M Shrigley

INSPECTOR