



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 June 2020

by Martin Chandler BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/20/3250573

31 Webb Lane, Hall Green, Birmingham B28 8EB

- 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 Fawzi against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/10463/PA, dated 9 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 9 March 2020.
 - The development is proposed erection of single storey rear extension, roof alterations, front and side rooflights, rear dormer window, raised patio, installation of front bay and porch, detached outbuilding to rear with solar panels.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for proposed erection of single storey rear extension, roof alterations, front and side rooflights, rear dormer window, raised patio, installation of front bay and porch, detached outbuilding to rear with solar panels at 31 Webb Lane, Hall Green, Birmingham B28 8EB, in accordance with application Ref: 2019/10463/PA, dated 9 December 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
 - 2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following drawing numbers: 3307/02/E and 3307/03/D.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The proposal seeks several alterations to the existing bungalow. The Council have confirmed that much of these works are acceptable to them, and based on the evidence before me, I have no reason to disagree. The harm, as articulated by the Council, arises from the proposed rear extension. The Council's adopted guidance relating to Extending Your Home (SPG) states that to achieve good design, extensions should respect and not dominate the appearance of the home.
4. The rear extension would be single storey and would span the full width of the property. As a consequence, it would be a wide extension. However, it would not project a significant distance into the rear of the site, and it would also

have a flat roof, matters which would combine to limit the overall bulk of the addition. Accordingly, due to its limited height and depth, the extension would not be disproportionate to the existing building, and it would therefore not dominate the appearance of the home. Instead, I am satisfied that the proposal would be recessive in scale and height to the overall bulk of the existing building. It would therefore be a suitably respectful addition.

5. Consequently, I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore accord with Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan (2017), saved Paragraphs 3.14C-D of the Birmingham Unitary Development Plan (2005) and guidance contained within the SPG. Taken together, these seek amongst other things, a high standard of design.

Conclusion

6. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted.

Martin Chandler

INSPECTOR