
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2020

by S Shapland BSc (Hons) MSc CMILT MCIHT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/20/3259069

18 Hollie Lucas Road, Birmingham B13 0QL

- 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 Khalil Ahmed against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/05297/PA , dated 10 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 September 2020.
 - The development proposed was originally described as "change recently approved and (part) constructed roof from hip to gable end and widen dormer".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for change recently approved and (part) constructed roof from hip to gable end and widen dormer at 18 Hollie Lucas Road, Birmingham B13 0QL, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2020/05297/PA, dated 10 July 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: A103 Location Plan, A101 Plans Existing, A102 Elevations Existing, A102 Proposed Elevations, A101 Proposed Plans
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form a different wording has been entered, and this description has been used by the Council in the decision notice. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a semi-detached dwelling located within an established residential area. The appeal site benefits from extant planning permission¹ for a two storey side and rear and single storey front and rear extension. This would feature a hipped roof arrangement. It was evident during my site visit that those works were well underway. The appeal proposal seeks to alter the hipped roof to a gable ended roof, and enlarge the rear dormer.
5. The extending your home supplementary planning document (SPD) provides a design guide in respect of home extensions. It seeks to ensure that extensions are well designed and respect the appearance of the local area. It states that side extensions should be designed to look less important than the existing building, with a ridge line that is generally lower than that of the main roof. In respect of roofs it states that the roof of any extension should fit in with the type and style of roofs in the area.
6. It was evident from my site visit that whilst the predominant roof style in the vicinity of the appeal site are hipped roofs, there are other roof styles including pyramids. There were examples of properties which have undergone hip to gable conversion, albeit that the extensions of these were of a hipped arrangement. Whilst there is a general uniformity to the roof style, the examples of roofs which aren't hipped arrangements has not detracted from the street scene, and do not appear as incongruous nor harm the character of the area.
7. The Council have raised concerns that the proposed extension would be of a scale, mass and design which is not acceptable and would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Whilst the introduction of a gable end on the roof and extension would be somewhat unique, it would not be the first example of a gable end roof in the vicinity. It is my view that the proposal would be of a design and scale which is appropriate for this location, taking into consideration the variations of roof types on the street scene. The two storey side extension would be set back from the front elevation and have a lower ridge height than the main roof of the dwelling. This would ensure subservience as required by the SPD.
8. The proposal would provide an enlarged dormer on the rear of the property, which would have a flat roof. I have carefully considered the Council's contention that this would result in a contrived cluttered design to the rear of the roof. However, the extant permission included a flat roof dormer, and in this respect the proposal would only be enlarging this dormer and would not be introducing a new feature when compared to the extant permission. In this respect, the enlarged dormer would appear no more contrived than that which is already consented. Furthermore, the proposed dormer would not stretch the full width of the property and as such would not appear as overly cluttered.
9. Whilst I recognise that the proposal would somewhat unbalance the symmetry with the adjoining property of No.20 Hollie Lucas Road, this pair of semi-detached dwellings already have a differing design by virtue of the extant planning consent for a side extension. There is already an element of unbalancing due to this side extension. In this respect whilst the roof type would be at odds with the adjoining dwelling, the changes to the roof would not

¹ 2019/08833/PA

in my view, provide such a contrast in design that the proposal would harm the appearance of the host dwelling.

10. The Council have raised concerns that by allowing the appeal a precedent would be set for other such proposals in the local area. Each application and appeal must be judged on its own merits, and I have not been provided with any compelling evidence to indicate that should the appeal be allowed this would encourage similar development in the area.
11. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. As such I find no conflict with policies PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan 2017 and paragraphs 3.14C-D of the Birmingham Unitary Development Plan. Together these policies seek, amongst other things, that development is of a high quality design that is of a scale and design that respect the area surrounding them. I find no conflict with the SPD, which seeks amongst other things that house extensions respect the appearance of the local area and host dwelling. The proposal would accord with section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. This seeks, amongst other things that development is well designed and is sympathetic to the local character.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time limit condition I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interest of certainty. A condition relating to external materials is necessary to ensure that the appearance of the proposal would be satisfactory.

Conclusions

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

S Shapland

INSPECTOR