



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 26 July 2021

by Mr James Blackwell LLB (Hons)

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/21/3275258

26 Coleshill Road, Birmingham B36 8AA

- 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 Zahid Younis against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/01715/PA, dated 26 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of two storey side and rear extensions and single storey rear extensions, forward porch and erection of boundary wall and railings to the front and side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for Costs

2. An application for costs has been made by Mr Zahid Younis against Birmingham City Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. I have used the Council's description of development as this has been explicitly agreed by the appellant and more accurately describes the proposal.
4. Since determination of the planning application, the 2019 iteration of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) has been superseded. I do not consider that the updates to the Framework materially affect its content insofar as it is relevant to the main issues of this appeal. I have therefore determined this appeal with regard to the latest version (2021) and am satisfied that this approach will not prejudice the main parties or their cases in regard to the appeal.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a detached dwelling on a busy road in a mixed residential/commercial area. The appeal dwelling, together with Nos 18 – 24, sit between 2 small service roads which provide access to a park behind. This means these dwellings are clearly sectioned off from other dwellings along the road. The appeal property occupies the corner plot within this section where Coleshill Road meets the northern-most service road. Whilst the surrounding

- area is mixed and does include a variety of house types, the dwellings within this section are generally consistent in terms of size, overall design and roof type. These common features provide a strong degree of uniformity between these dwellings which contributes positively to this aspect of the street scene.
7. The proposed development would considerably extend the width of the appeal dwelling and would incorporate symmetrical bay windows at ground and first floor level on either side of the front entrance. These alterations would appear dominant, as the entire frontage of the appeal dwelling would become significantly wider than the frontages of Nos 18 – 24, which would imbalance the consistency in size and scale between these dwellings. The addition of a second set of bay windows entirely on the property's principal frontage would also exacerbate this prominence, as the other dwellings within this section only include a single bay (at ground and first floor level) adjacent to their front entrances. Together, these changes would therefore detract from the uniformity shared between the appeal property and Nos 18 – 26.
 8. The appeal property has a hipped roof which is again broadly consistent in design with the neighbouring properties at Nos 18 – 24. The proposed development would reconfigure the roof, with each side roof plane meeting a substantial area of flat roof over the bulk of the property. It would introduce a second gable over the additional set of bay windows on its frontage, as well a front dormer between the two, both of which would be unique to the dwellings in this section of the road. As a result, these changes would jar with the prevailing pattern of largely unaltered hipped roofs which characterise this section of the road, which in turn would detract from the uniformity shared between these properties. When taken with my findings above, this loss of uniformity would harm the street scene and thus the character and appearance of the area.
 9. The proposed development would therefore conflict with Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan (2017)¹ and saved Policies 3.14C and 3.14D of the Birmingham Unitary Development Plan (2005)² which require new development to respond to local character through high quality design which is appropriate in scale and design. The development would also conflict with guidance in the Home Extensions Design Guide SPG (2007)³ which is explicit that extensions should be smaller than the main part of the original house and should complement the size and scale of neighbouring properties particularly in terms of width and height. Finally, the development would conflict with the overarching design objectives of the Framework.

Other Matters

10. There are a significant number of commercial premises near to the appeal property which means the prevailing character of the area in land use terms is mixed. Irrespective, the appeal property is within a clearly defined section of road where there is uniformity between house types, which means the scale of alterations proposed cannot be accommodated without upsetting the current degree of visual harmony between these dwellings.

¹ Birmingham Plan 2031, Birmingham Development Plan, Adopted 2017

² The Birmingham Plan, Birmingham Unitary Development Plan 2005

³ Extending Your Home, Home Extensions Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document, March 2007

11. Whilst I note the trees and other boundary treatments which separate the road from Nos 18 – 26, I do not consider that such screening would mitigate the harm that would be caused by the development to the street scene.
12. Examples of other properties along Coleshill Road and Hodge Hill Common have been provided. These have been substantially extended, so the surrounding context for them is different to the appeal dwelling. They are also further down the road where there is significantly less consistency in terms of size, scale and design of buildings. This means it is possible for more substantial alterations to integrate with the street scene without detracting from any pre-existing level of uniformity. My conclusions on the main issue of the case do not therefore change.
13. When considered in isolation I agree with the appellant that the proposal would complement the appearance of the appeal dwelling itself. The development would help unify the property's frontage, by integrating its existing side and rear extensions and its large rear dormer more effectively. However, this would not make up for how harmful the proposed changes would appear in a wider context.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, and having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework and all relevant material considerations, the appeal should be dismissed.

James Blackwell

INSPECTOR