



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 11 May 2021 by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/21/3270237

5 The Vale, Sparkhill, Birmingham B11 4EN

- 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 Azaj Beg against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/08348/PA, dated 12 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is ground floor front sides/rear extension/ first floor bedroom extension and second floor 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 effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The modestly sized dwellings along The Vale vary in appearance, although there are typically groups of similarly designed dwellings within the street scene which provides a degree of architectural consistency which contributes to the attractive street scene. No individual dwelling stands out or appears incongruous, despite the varying appearance of the dwellings.
5. No 5 is a two-storey dwelling with a two-storey front bay window alongside a two-storey front outrigger and a hipped roof which is similar in design to nearby properties, albeit its side extension differentiates it from the other correspondingly designed dwellings. The two-storey front bay windows are an architectural feature found on a number of dwellings within the street scene and this consistent feature is a positive characteristic.
6. The proposed extensions would result in a dwelling which bears no resemblance to the host dwelling either in scale, style, character or appearance. They would dominate the character and appearance of the host dwelling to its detriment.
7. As a consequence, the positive contribution the host dwelling makes to the character and appearance of the area would be significantly eroded. The

extended dwelling whilst containing some features which are characteristic of the area, such as dormer windows and balconies, would nevertheless introduce an alien addition into the street scene which would not reflect the scale, design or appearance of nearby dwellings. It would result in a prominent, intrusive feature which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene.

8. Given the layout of the development within the wider area, the rear of the dwelling is not visible within the public domain and as a result the proposed development to the rear of the dwelling, including the balcony would have a very limited impact upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the street scene. However, the absence of harm in this regard does not outweigh the harm identified above.
9. I have considered the Council's argument that the proposal would set a precedent for similar proposals, however, no examples of where this might occur has been provided. In any event, each planning application and appeal is to be considered on its own individual merits. Consequently, a generalised concern of this nature is not sufficient reason to refuse the proposal.
10. Nevertheless, given the scale and appearance of the proposed development, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene in conflict with Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan 2031 (adopted 2017) as well as paragraphs 3.14 C-D of the Birmingham Unitary Development Plan 2005 (adopted 1993) insofar as they expect development to be designed to respond to site conditions and the local area context. The proposal would also be contrary to the advice set out in the Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document (2007) which identifies the importance of ensuring extensions fit comfortably in with the existing property and character of the area, and paragraph 127 of the National Planning Policy Framework which expects development to add to the overall quality of the area and be sympathetic to local character and history.

Other Matters

11. There were a number of comments regarding other development that has taken place on the site. These elements were not included as part of the proposal and as a result were not considered as part of this appeal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. There are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Sibley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and agree with the recommendation. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR