

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2020

by K E Down MA(Oxon) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/20/3259853

107 Croftdown Road, Harborne, Birmingham, B17 8RE

- 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 Baljinder Singh against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/01817/PA, dated 25 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side and rear extension, loft conversion, single storey rear extension and entrance canopy.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two storey side and rear extension, loft conversion, single storey rear extension and entrance canopy at 107 Croftdown Road, Harborne, Birmingham, B17 8RE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2020/01817/PA, dated 25 February 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: location plan, BS219-01, BS219-02, BS219-03B, BS219-04B and BS219-05B.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed extensions on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Croftdown Road.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a traditional two storey, semi-detached dwelling with a two storey front bay and a flat roofed first floor dormer set into the roof slope which extends down to an enclosed front porch. It has a large, single storey
-

garage to the side which would be demolished to make way for the proposed side extension.

4. The house is set at the end of a row of similar semi-detached dwellings. The adjacent dwelling at No 105 is a large, detached house of markedly different design. Croftdown Road is a wide and well established street in which dwellings which vary in design but share common architectural features are set back from the highway behind generous frontages and wide verges. The overall character is one of a pleasant, spacious, verdant and cohesive street scene.
5. All of the five dwellings similar to the appeal property have existing extensions which, when seen from the street, are broadly comparable with the appeal proposal. The design of the proposed extension, with a catslide roof and modest first floor dormer set back from the front elevation and existing dormer, would ensure that it appeared subservient to the host dwelling with the two storey bay maintaining its prominence and importance.
6. The Council is concerned that the extension would be wider than the other similar extensions that have been permitted nearby but states that it would be 5.5m in width. The submitted plans clearly indicate a width of 5m. Although this would be about 0.8m wider than the approximate width attributed by the Council to the other nearby extensions, the width would not be excessive and the extension would be noticeably narrower than the original dwelling. It would not therefore appear overly wide in comparison with the host dwelling or in the street scene.
7. Of the other similar extensions, four have a continuous ridge with only the semi-detached pair at No 109 having a reduced ridge height over the extension. These existing extensions appear harmonious, do not dominate the host dwellings and the different ridge height between the extensions at Nos 109 and 111 does not appear out of place. Notwithstanding the difference between the appeal proposal and the existing extension at No 109, I am therefore satisfied that in this case a set down ridge line is not necessary to avoid a dominant roof form or lack of balance and the continuous ridge proposed would blend with the existing pattern of development, including at the semi-detached pair.
8. A gap of some 1m would remain between the side of the extension and the property boundary. This is more than exists at present between the garage and the side boundary and would be commensurate with the gaps between other dwellings nearby. I accept that the garage, which is of permanent construction and appears to be of long standing, is single storey but the remaining gap, the subservient, set back design of the extension and the space to the front of the dwelling would ensure that it did not appear cramped on its plot, result in a terracing effect or materially detract from the spaciousness of the area.
9. The Council considers the proposed front porch extension to be acceptable and I agree with this view. No objection is raised to the two storey and single storey rear extensions which would, at ground floor, largely replace existing structures that would be demolished. I agree that these rear extensions would be acceptable since they would result in a better designed and more coordinated rear elevation.
10. It is concluded on the main issue that the proposed extensions would have no materially detrimental effect on the character or appearance of the host

dwelling or the street scene of Croftdown Road. In consequence, the proposed extensions would comply with Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan, 2017, saved Paragraphs 3.14C-D of the Birmingham Plan, 2005, the Council's supplementary planning document "Extending your home" 2007 and the National Planning Policy Framework. Taken together, these expect residential extensions to be visually attractive as a result of good architecture, such that they contribute to a strong sense of place and reinforce local distinctiveness and character, with design that responds to site conditions and the local area context.

11. In addition to the statutory commencement condition, the Council suggests two other conditions. I agree that for the avoidance of doubt the development should be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and also that in order to protect the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area external materials should match those used in the existing building. I shall impose conditions to control these matters.
12. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

KE Down
INSPECTOR