



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/20/3251748

Rear of 53 Coronation Road, Selly Oak, Birmingham B29 7DE

- 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 Sandeep Krishan against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/10514/PA, dated 18 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 February 2020.
 - The development is proposed three storey rear extension and new windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for proposed three storey rear extension and new windows, at Rear of 53 Coronation Road, Selly Oak, Birmingham B29 7DE in accordance with the terms of application ref: 2019/10514/PA, dated 18 December 2019 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: 832/001/A and 832/002/D.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is occupied by a wide-fronted two storey property with additional accommodation within the roofspace. Despite its width when viewed from the street, the footprint of the building has a limited depth due to the triangular nature of the site. This tapering of the site has the effect of limiting the space to the rear of the building.
4. 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. The proposal would introduce two full height gable extensions, either side of an existing gable feature within the roof. As with the existing building, and as necessitated by the site, they would have a limited depth and the proposed width would ensure that their ridge height would not breach the overall height of the building.

5. Due to the height and width of the gable extensions, the proportions and overall form of the proposal would complement and respect the scale and mass of the existing building. Accordingly, it would not overwhelm or dominate the rear elevation of the property.
6. The side elevation of the appeal site is visible from the public realm and therefore the proposed extensions would also be seen. However, as identified above, the extensions would have a limited depth and would also be no higher than the existing building. Consequently, the additional mass would not appear overly large when viewed from the public realm. The projecting wings would be proportionate to the existing building and would retain sufficient space between the building and rear boundary to ensure that the proposal would not appear as an overdevelopment of the site.
7. Accordingly, for the reasons identified above, I conclude that the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore comply 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

8. The appeal is allowed.

Martin Chandler

INSPECTOR