



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2020 by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/20/3252426

2 Morden Road, Birmingham B33 8SR

- 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 Mohammed Yaseen against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref: 2019/10630/PA, dated 23 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. No.2 is a two and a half storey end terrace dwelling that has an initial two storey rear 'dog leg' extension which reduces to a single storey extension. The dwelling is constructed from red brick with decorative lintels above the windows as well as ornate fascia's above the dormer window and bay windows. The main entrance door, which has an attractive porch above it is situated on the Morden Road frontage and the bay window and other windows on that aspect match the attractive detailing on the Albert Road frontage. Because of this architectural detailing the Morden Road elevation provides an attractive façade which enhances the character of the area. The two-storey element of the rear extension has been covered by a white render and the single storey element painted a cream colour. Because the rear elevation has been painted a different colour to the rest of the house the extension is clearly defined from the host dwelling. The dwelling on the opposite side of Modern Road is similarly designed but does not have the single storey rear extension and the rear extension has not been rendered.
5. Morden Road rises towards Albert Road and, because of this, the side elevation of No.2 is more visible and thus more prominent within the street scene,

especially when entering Morden Road. The dwellings along Albert Road either side of the junction have comparatively deep gardens and because the rear extensions do not extend the full depth of the gardens, these gardens create an open appearance which acts as a transition into the more open and suburban character along the tree lined Morden Street compared to the more urban and densely developed Albert Street.

6. The proposed extension would connect to the rear elevation of the single storey element of the rear 'dog leg' extension and would extend it by approximately 3 metres (m). The existing rear 'dog leg' extension for No.2 Morden Road is a similar depth to the rear extensions on the dwellings on the opposite side of Morden Road. No.2 and the dwelling on the opposite side of the junction are similarly designed dwellings and their mirrored appearance positively contributes to the appearance of the street scene around the junction.
7. The appearance of the proposed extension, as well as the existing extensions, would not show the same level of architectural detailing that is apparent on the host dwelling and thus the utilitarian design of the combined extension would detract from the character of the host dwelling. The combined rear extensions would be more than twice the depth of the host dwelling and would extend to almost the full depth of the garden. This would give the property an elongated plan form at the rear and would overdevelop the garden area thereby eroding the pleasant sense of openness when viewed from Morden Road.
8. Whilst in isolation the single storey extension would be a minor addition to the dwelling, the cumulative extensions would create a rear extension that would be significantly deeper than the comparative rear extensions along Albert Road. The current depth of the rear extensions that are visible within the street scene ensures that the open appearance around the junction to the rear of the extensions is retained and whilst the extension would only be single storey it would introduce built form into an undeveloped portion of the road that positively contributes to the open appearance of the street scene.
9. Therefore, the extension, combined with the existing extensions, would be an incongruous addition to the dwelling and thus the proposed extension would detract from the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene. Consequently, the proposed extension would be contrary to Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan 2031 (adopted 2019) which requires development to reinforce or create a positive sense of place and local distinctiveness, with design that responds to site conditions and local area context. The proposal would also be contrary to paragraph 3.14 C-D which requires the scale and design of new buildings and spaces to respect the area surrounding them. The proposal would be contrary to the Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document (adopted 2007) which states that building across the whole area of a corner plot would spoil the appearance of the street scene. The proposed extension would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as it requires development to be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, layout and appropriate and effective landscaping.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Sibley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR