



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/20/3250578

31 Cecil Road, Selly Oak, Birmingham B29 7QG

- 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 & Mrs R & G Nurser against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/00191/PA, dated 8 January 2020, was refused by an undated decision notice.
 - The development proposed is ground floor side extension and changes to existing rear ground floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for ground floor side extension and changes to existing rear ground floor extension and changes to existing rear ground floor extension at 31 Cecil Road, Selly Oak, Birmingham B29 7QG, in accordance with application ref: 2020/00191/PA, dated 8 January 2020 and 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: 283_AR_000_012; 283_AR_000_022; L 283_AR_000_001; 283_AR_030_011_B; 282_AR_040_011_A; and 282_AR_040_012_A.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a terraced property. To the rear, it has a traditional two storey projecting wing with an additional single storey projection beyond. Both elements currently have mono-pitch roofs with their highest point on the shared side boundary.
4. The proposal would replace the mono-pitch roof with a flat roof at single storey level. Accordingly, the more traditional roof form would be lost. However, the single storey projection would remain subservient in scale to the principal rear wing. Consequently, the vast majority of the traditional form of the building

would remain entirely visible, thereby preserving the visual interest of the rear elevation.

5. The side extension would be primarily constructed from glass and the mono-pitch roof would represent a somewhat abrupt change from the proposed flat roof. However, this element of the proposal would help to define the form and scale of the original wing. It would also reduce the bulk of the extension close to the shared boundary. Accordingly, I am satisfied that this element of the proposal would also be appropriate to the form of the existing building.
6. 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. Taken together, the proposed extension would be a modest addition to the property. It would not dominate the appearance of the whole house and instead, it would achieve a suitable degree of subservience to the existing building. 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

7. For the reasons identified above, the appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted.

Martin Chandler

INSPECTOR