



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2020

by Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/20/3253756

21 Cranmer Grove, Sutton Coldfield B74 4XT

- 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 Mrs Clare Waldron against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/00679/PA, dated 24 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension above existing garage, conversion of garage and new detached garage on land adjacent to house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. I find no reason to disagree with the Council that the proposed extension and conversion of garage would be acceptable in terms of their effect on neighbouring properties and the locality in general. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposed garage on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Despite the partial screening effect of vegetation along the road, the garage would be clearly seen from various parts of Cranmer Grove and from nearby properties. The introduction of a building on the front of the site would be at odds with the open front gardens in the cul-de-sac and the prevalent pattern of garages set back from the highway. Also, while it would be smaller than the main house, the new garage would obstruct views of the property from the street and so would detract from its appearance.
4. The proposal would be markedly more obtrusive than the garages at 18 and 19 Cranmer Grove which are set behind adjoining houses. Also, the other properties referred to with detached garages to the front are not seen in the same context of the appeal site and so they do not influence the character of its immediate surroundings. Furthermore, the garage would have a more noticeable and harmful effect on the street scene than the suggested alternative of hardstanding to the front of the house.
5. For these reasons, I conclude the proposed garage would harm the character and appearance of the area. In this regard, it would be contrary to policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan 2017, saved paragraphs 3.14C-D of the Birmingham Unitary Development Plan 2005 and the Council's Extending Your

Home Supplementary Planning Document 2007. These all aim, amongst other things, to ensure development respects and reflects its context.

Other Matters and Conclusion

6. The development would result in a more efficient use of land in terms of the number of residents that could live on the site and would address the appellant's accommodation requirements. However, these benefits could be achieved without the proposed garage and so fail to override the harm identified in respect of the main issue.
7. The development when considered as a whole would be contrary to development plan policies. There is no justification to make a decision contrary to the development plan and so the appeal is dismissed.

Jonathan Edwards

INSPECTOR