
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2022 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/22/3301654

2 Clun Road, Birmingham, B31 1NU

- 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 Mike Armstrong against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
- The application Ref 2022/01423/PA, dated 18 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 14 June 2022.
- The development proposed is two storey side and single storey side and rear extension.

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 main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling within an established residential area with a similar style of properties. There is a pleasing degree of symmetry between the dwelling and its attached neighbour in terms of the rectangular building footprint, fenestration and the gable roof form. The pair occupy a very prominent corner plot at the junction of Clun Road and Spiceland Road. To the side of the dwelling is an electricity substation, the boundaries of which give an irregular shape to the plot. There is an existing single storey garage to the side of the dwelling, which is splayed to the rear, reflecting this irregular shape.
5. The two storey side extension would be set down from the ridge line of the dwelling and set back from the front elevation, in an attempt to break up the scale and mass of the proposal. However, the width would be substantial in relation to the width of the existing property, extending close to the boundary with the adjacent substation. In addition, due to the irregular shape of the plot the flank wall of the extension would be splayed which would look incongruous when set against the simple form of the symmetrical pair of dwellings. It would appear as a contrived design solution dictated by the irregular form of the plot, rather than the form or appearance of the dwelling itself.

6. Overall, due to its width, depth and bulk, the proposed extension would not be subordinate in scale or appearance to the host dwelling. The corner location of the dwelling means that the extension would have an imposing and unduly prominent appearance when viewed from both Clun Road and Spiceland Road, particularly in relation to the resultant angled gable wall.
7. I acknowledge that the extension has been designed to make best use of the unusual shape of the site and that it is not as wide as the host dwelling, however these matters do not outweigh the harm I have identified.
8. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude that the proposed extension would harm the appearance of the host dwelling and the character of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan (2017), Policy DM2 of the Development Management in Birmingham Development Plan Document (2021) and guidance contained in the Extending Your Home: Home Extensions Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2007) which together amongst other matters seek to ensure that development is of a high design quality contributing to a sense of place, with scale and design respecting the surrounding area and reinforcing local distinctiveness. It would also conflict with the design aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, that outweigh this conflict. I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR