



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 10 November 2020 by Gareth Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

Decision by Sarah Housden BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/20/3255894

2 Beech Avenue, Quinton, Birmingham B32 2UB

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 Sunil Sharma against the decision of Birmingham City Council.

The application Ref 2020/02474/PA, dated 26 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 May 2020.

The development proposed is single storey side extension and part two 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.

Preliminary Matters

3. The garage and side lean-to referred to by both parties have been demolished. Furthermore, the dwelling has a single storey rear extension that is not shown on the existing elevations plan (HSS219 – 01A). The single storey rear extension does not match what is shown on the proposed elevations plan (HSS219 – 02A10). For the avoidance of any doubt, I have assessed the appeal based on the details of the site and the proposed development as shown on the submitted plans.
4. There are discrepancies in drawing number HSS219 – 02A10 in relation to the roof details of the proposed single storey side extension. The proposed front and rear elevations and their written annotations indicate that it would have a hipped roof whereas the side elevation shows a gabled roof. Based on the appellant's statement of case which indicates that the extension would incorporate the design features of the existing dwelling, I have assessed the proposed side extension on the basis that it would have a hipped roof to match the existing property.

Main Issue

5. The effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the Quinton Lane street scene.

Reasons for the recommendation

6. No.2 Beech Avenue is a two-storey detached dwelling located on a corner plot at the junction between Beech Avenue and Quinton Lane. The side boundary onto Quinton Lane is bounded by fencing above a retaining wall. Beech Avenue rises away from Quinton Lane and because of this No.2 is located on higher ground than the surrounding dwellings on Quinton Lane and occupies a prominent corner location within the street scene. The flank wall of the dwelling faces towards Quinton Lane and is set forward of the building line along that road, which is relatively consistent, despite the curve in the road. The street scene is characterised by two storey semi-detached dwellings set back behind tree lined roads which contributes to an established and spacious character and appearance.
7. The proposed two-storey rear extension would be approximately half the width and depth of the host dwelling and would have a hipped roof to match the main dwelling. Whilst it would be visible from Quinton Lane, there would be adequate separation distance between the two-storey extension and the road so that it would not cause harm to the character or appearance of the street scene. Given its depth and single storey height, the rear lean-to extension would be an appropriate addition and would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the street scene. The proposed porch would be modest in scale and would be constructed from similar materials as the host dwelling which are common within the street scene.
8. However, the width of the proposed side extension would be approximately the same width as the host dwelling and whilst it would be single storey, due to the combination of its width and bulk it would appear as a cumbersome and disproportionate addition which would not be subordinate to the modest proportions and scale of the host dwelling. Furthermore, the shallow pitched roof would have a horizontal emphasis, at odds with the proportions of the house which would be further emphasised given the elevated location of the dwelling on this open corner site.
9. The former garage and extension to the side of the dwelling were positioned forward of the established building line along Quinton Lane, but comprised two separate and smaller structures. Due to its bulk, height and the elevated position of the dwelling, the side extension would be a much more visually prominent and imposing feature. This combined with its position forward of the front elevations of the dwellings on Quinton Lane would result in an overly dominant and conspicuous appearance which would be harmful to the spacious character and appearance of the street scene.
10. I recognise that the proposal has been revised following a previous appeal decision¹ but I have assessed the scheme based on the details before me and the effect on the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would contribute towards the need to make best use of existing buildings and the efficient use of land and would provide suitable family accommodation.

¹ Reference APP/P4605/D/19/3242264

Nevertheless, this would not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the Quinton Lane Street scene by the side extension.

11. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan 2031 (adopted 2017) which expects all development to demonstrate a high design quality, contributing to a strong sense of place. Furthermore, the proposal would be contrary to saved policy 3.14 C-D of the Birmingham Unitary Development Plan 2005 (adopted 1993) which states that the scale and design of new buildings and spaces should generally respect the area surrounding them, and should reinforce and evolve any local characteristics. There would also be conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which indicates that development should add to the overall quality of an area.

Other Matters

12. Had my findings in relation to the main issue in this case been more favourable, it would have been necessary to address comments on other matters from the adjoining occupier at No. 4 Beech Avenue and other local residents in more detail. However, as I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons and since it will not affect the overall outcome, I make no further comments on those points.

Conclusion

13. 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

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

Sarah Housden

INSPECTOR