
Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 26 October 2021 by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/21/3278118

26 Blenheim Road, Birmingham B13 9TY

- 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 Mrs Shirley Mallon against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/00966/PA, dated 4 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is extension of existing loft over existing flat roof to form second floor living space.
-

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.

Preliminary Matter

3. On 20 July 2021 the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). The main parties have been provided with a further opportunity to make submissions in respect of the publication. Any comments received have been addressed in this decision.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposed extension upon the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. No 26 is a semi-detached dwelling with a steep hipped roof which is replicated on the attached dwelling. One pair of the neighbouring dwellings are similarly designed but within the wider street scene the character and appearance of the dwellings varies. Although previously extended, the steep hipped roof remains an important characteristic of the host dwelling. The consistent proportions across the pair creates a balanced appearance which positively contributes to the character and appearance of these dwellings and the wider street scene.
6. The proposal would introduce a new roof form above and behind the hipped roof slope in the form of a narrow gable facing perpendicular to the main roof. Additionally, the rear gabled element of the proposal would create a largely

blank wall to the front that would extend out across the roof slope, beyond the front gable addition. The half-hipped roof over the existing extension would extend beyond the flank wall of the main house and beyond the main roof. Together these features would erode the primacy of the hipped roof. While slightly lower than the main roof ridge, the form and proportions of the proposed roof alterations, combined with their scale, would result in an awkward and alien roof form that would create a cluttered appearance and fail to respect the style and proportions of the dwelling.

7. Whilst the existing extension does project beyond the flank wall of the house, given its set back and relatively low height it is not overly visible within the street scene. The existing dormer follows the orientation of the house, faces to the side in common with others in the street scene and is subservient in scale to the main roof. In contrast, the proposed extension would not appear subordinate in scale and would be highly visible within the street scene. It would appear as an awkward and disproportionate addition, eroding the gap between the hipped roofs of the host property and its neighbour.
8. Therefore, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene. It would be contrary to Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan (adopted 2017) and saved paragraph 3.14D of the Birmingham Unitary Development Plan (adopted 1993). These policies expect development to reinforce or create a positive sense of place and local distinctiveness, with design that responds to site conditions and the local area context.
9. Moreover, the proposal would not accord with the guidance set out in the Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document (2007) in respect of the design of side and roof extensions. Additionally, it would be contrary to paragraph 130 of the Framework which states that development proposals should function well and add to the overall quality of the area as well as being visually attractive and sympathetic to local character and history.

Other Matters

10. The proposal would create additional useable floorspace for the occupiers of the appeal site, however this is a private benefit which does not outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

G Sibley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree and shall dismiss the appeal.

L McKay

INSPECTOR