



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 March 2021

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date:

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/W/20/3263199

765 Pershore Road, Selly Oak, Birmingham B29 7NY

- 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 A Azadi against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/06033/PA, dated 3 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of detached bungalow and installation of new access to existing property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of development has been changed from the application form. This has been done by the Council with the agreement of the appellant. As a result, I am satisfied that neither party has been prejudiced by this change of description.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located at the junction of Pershore Road and Kensington Road. The site is currently part of the garden area of the existing dwelling. The area is predominately residential in nature.
5. The proposal seeks to erect a single storey dwelling in part of the garden area of the host dwelling, utilising the existing access, and creating a new access on Pershore Road for the use of the existing dwelling.
6. The regularity of building layout, seen on Kensington Road, the adjacent properties to the site on Pershore Road as well as the properties opposite, gives a cohesive character to the area. The appeal site contributes positively to this character through the siting of the dwelling in the overall site, spacious side garden area and set-back from Pershore Road and Kensington Road.
7. I find that the proposal would not reflect this cohesive pattern of development of within which it would be predominantly viewed. Whilst being level with the Kensington Road properties, the proposed dwelling would project forward of the building line on Pershore Road, resulting in a prominent elevation with

limited visual relief on Pershore Road. The existing dwelling's comparatively narrow width that remains after the site is sub-divided would not be typical of that immediate area on Pershore Road, however it meets Council guidance in the required private amenity space remaining following sub-division of the appeal site.

8. The impact of the appeal proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. The harm would be by virtue of the projection forward of the building line on Pershore Road and the reduced plot size of the host dwelling. These aspects of the proposal would emphasise the incongruous appearance of the proposal within its immediate visual context, unbalancing the rhythm of the Pershore Road street form and would be harmful to its established character and appearance. The proposal would therefore not reflect the characteristic form and spacing of buildings in the immediate locality.
9. As a result I find that the proposals are contrary to policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan (2017), policies 3.14C-D of the Birmingham Unitary Development Plan (2005), guidance in the Places for Living Supplementary Planning Document (2001) and the Mature Suburbs Supplementary Planning Document (2008), which amongst other matters, expect development to create a positive sense of place that responds to site conditions and the local area context and have regard to the impact on the local character of the area.

Conclusion

10. Therefore, for the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR