
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2020

by J P Longmuir BA (Hons) DipUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/W/20/3249443

956 Pershore Road, Selly Oak, Birmingham, B29 7PU

- 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 Kris Krasimov against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/10682/PA, dated 29 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is the change of use from single dwelling to house 3 self-contained flats (Use Class C3) and installation of rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development and appellant's details are taken from the appeal form because this provides more details.

Main issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the living conditions of the potential occupants in terms of internal space and daylighting and;
 - the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living conditions

4. The appeal building is a two and half storey terraced property with a long narrow garden. The proposal is for 3 flats spread over the three different floors of the building. One would be accessed through the front door and the other two by shared stairs from a new side entrance off an alley.
5. The Technical housing standards-nationally described space standard, advises a minimum of 39sqm for a one person one bedroom flat. However the smallest flat would only be 35sqm total internal floorspace. Furthermore,

the bathroom and toilet would be directly accessed from the kitchen/lounge, which would exacerbate the implications of the limited space.

6. The ground floor flat would be 50sqm and the above standard advises 61sqm for a 2-person flat. This would be a significant shortfall and would be too restrictive in floorspace to allow a reasonable quality of life for two people.
7. The Council's decision notice refers to a limited outlook and daylighting due to a narrow window. However, the window would be an average width standard casement and any perceived narrowness would be compensated by a reasonable length. The window would provide an outlook and daylighting in the central point of the room and it would only be the doorway and circulation area where full daylighting and outlook would be poor. Furthermore, the window has an approximately western aspect which would catch some sunlight. In any event, the current use is as a bedroom which would be unchanged by the proposal. The flat would have adequate light but this factor would not overcome the lack of floorspace.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not provide adequate living conditions. Policies PG3, TP27 and TP35 of the Birmingham Development Plan (DP), saved paragraphs 8.23-8.25 of the Birmingham Unitary Development Plan (UDP) as well as the Places for Living Supplementary Planning Guidance, seek to ensure satisfactory living conditions for new residents and make best use of the existing housing stock. The proposal would be in conflict with these policies and guidance.

Character and appearance

9. The appeal site is part of a terrace of two and half storey houses which closely front Pershore Road and have a consistent appearance. To the rear are two storey and single storey projecting offshoots. The proposal is for a dormer on the rear of the main roof, which would be very large spreading across both the width and height of the roofslope. The roofslope would be subsumed by the dormer, creating an unbalanced and top heavy look to the dwelling. The impact would be exacerbated by the proposed flat roof to the dormer, which would be odds with the main pitched roof.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. Policies PG3 of the DP, paragraphs 3.14C-D of the UDP and Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document, seek to promote quality design, in keeping with the area. The proposal would be in conflict with these policies and guidance.

Conclusion

11. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Longmuir

INSPECTOR