



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2020

by Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/20/3256824

219 Walsall Road, Perry Barr, Birmingham B42 1TY

- 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 Abu Malek against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/02521/PA, dated 26 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of single storey rear extension and creation of first floor, roof alteration and detached outbuilding to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appeal form and Council decision notice refer to the description included in the header above and so I have determined the appeal on the same basis. On my visit I saw an outbuilding, a roof addition and a ground floor extension under construction although these were significantly different to the appeal proposal. My assessment is based on the submitted drawings.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is in a row of dwellings with a degree of consistency in terms of height and form. The roof of the house at 225 Walsall Road has been enlarged but its eaves height and overall size remains similar to its neighbours.
5. The proposal would have a hipped roof but it would be notably higher to its eaves and would have a greater bulk compared to the appeal property as it stands and other dwellings in the row. The contrast in appearance between the enlarged appeal property and adjacent buildings would be conspicuous in the street scene, particularly as the development would be in the middle of the row and close to the houses on either side.
6. The rear extension and outbuilding would not be seen from the road and the development would not be cramped. Also, other roof extensions to bungalows and taller buildings exist in the area. However, these factors would not mitigate or override the marked incongruity of the proposal and its incompatibility with the adjoining dwellings.

7. For these reasons, I conclude the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, in this regard, it would not accord with policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan 2017, paragraphs 3.14C to D of the Birmingham Unitary Development Plan 2005 as well as the Council's Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document 2007. Amongst other things, these all aim to ensure development reinforces local distinctiveness and respects its surroundings.

Other Matters

8. The proposal would not harm the living conditions of occupiers of neighbouring properties but this is a neutral factor in my assessment. The development would improve the building's energy efficiency and would provide modern living facilities that meet the appellant's needs although there are alternative ways of achieving these benefits. The proposal would be a more efficient use of land and would provide a larger family dwelling, but the site already contains a residence. Overall, the advantages of the scheme would be modest and would fail to outweigh the harm that would be caused in respect of the main issue.

Conclusion

9. For these reasons, the appeal fails.

Jonathan Edwards

INSPECTOR