The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2021 by A J Sutton BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/20/3263073
31 Hathaway Drive, Four Oaks, Sutton Coldfield, West Midlands.

- 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 Michael Garland against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
- The application Ref 2020/05345/PA, dated 13 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 14 September 2020.
- The development proposed is described as 'Loft Conversion'.

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached hipped roof dwelling in a suburban street. The built form in this section of the street is mixed, but generally comprises mid 20th Century style detached and semi-detached properties. Whilst architectural detail is varied and some dwellings have been extended and altered at roof level, the hipped roof form is a prevailing positive and distinct feature on many of the properties in the area.

5. Although No 29 has been extended to the side, I observed the paired dwellings retained an appreciable symmetry at the front elevation and roof level, which is core to the original character of the properties, and, contributes to the general design coherency in this part of the street scene. The proposed extension would result in the complete loss of the hipped form which would harmfully alter a distinct original detail of the host property, and, would substantially unbalance the appearance of the paired dwellings. In doing so it would detrimentally erode a feature which characterises the immediate street scene.

6. It is therefore concluded that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. 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 advice set out in Extending your Home Supplementary Planning Document 2007, which collectively require that all new development is of a high design quality, having, amongst other matters, particular regard towards the impact the proposed development would have on the local character of the area. The proposal would also be inconsistent with the design policies of the National Planning Policy Framework which seek well-designed places.

Other Matters

7. Whilst noting the suggestion that the permitted development fall-back position would be of a lesser design quality to that proposed, no detailed drawings have been provided for a comparison to be made, thus this limits the weight that I can give this matter in my consideration of this case.

8. I am not persuaded, based on the evidence before me, that the proposed development would be the only means of securing additional space or energy efficiency measures. Furthermore, the benefit of such measures, given the quantum of the proposed development, would be small and would not outweigh the harm identified.

9. Nos 3, 13, 15, 28 and 37 are detached dwellings and are not directly comparable to the proposed development. The extension at No 16 comprises a hipped roof side dormer which is distinctly different to the proposals before me. Properties on the northern section of Hathaway Drive are pitched roof later additions with a different character to that of the appeal property. Other examples cited are located on surrounding streets where the context is different. As such these matters have not been determinative in this case.

10. The absence of objections to the proposal is a neutral factor and does not justify such harmful development.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A J Sutton

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and concur that the appeal should be dismissed.

R C Kirby

INSPECTOR