



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2022

by Tamsin Law BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/21/3285345

27 Bromford Road, Birmingham B36 8HU

- 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 Mohammed Husnat against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2021/07297/PA, dated 18 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in a predominantly residential area characterised by similarly designed pairs of semi-detached dwellings that have a reasonably symmetrical form and pleasant visual balance. Dwellings are set back from the highway with garden and/or parking areas to the front. The materials used in the area are fairly consistent and the layout and style of the properties along the road provides a consistent rhythm to the street scene.
4. I note that the width of the extension has been reduced following the Council's refusal of a previous scheme. Whilst the front part of the extension would be 3.8m wide, the rear part would nevertheless project 5m from the existing side elevation. Therefore, when viewed from Bromford Road, the extension would appear 5m wide, albeit with a step in it.
5. The proposed development would substantially extend the host dwelling to the side, thereby disrupting the marked balance and rhythm described above in terms of the host dwelling and the surrounding pattern of development. Although it would be set down from the ridge and set back from the front elevation, its height and width combined with the open aspect of the site frontage, would create a visually prominent and dominant addition. As such, the proposed development would be readily apparent from the public domain such that it would have a significantly detrimental effect on the street scene.
6. Consequently, I find the development would be in conflict with the relevant elements of Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan (2017), saved

paragraphs 3.14C and 3.14D of the Birmingham Unitary Development Plan (2005) and the guidance contained within the Birmingham City Council Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document (2007) and Places for Living Supplementary Planning Guidance (2001) which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that all new development responds to site conditions and the local area context. The appeal scheme would also be contrary to paragraph 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework that seeks good design sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

7. My attention was drawn to a previous application at the site and other properties in the locality where similar extensions have been permitted. However, I do not have full details of the previous application or details that led to these other proposals being accepted. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits.

Conclusion

8. For the above reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach of the Framework and all other relevant consideration, the appeal should be dismissed.

Tamsin Law

INSPECTOR