



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 September 2023

by E Pickernell BSc MSC MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17.10.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/23/3317057

402 Rectory Road, Sutton Trinity, Sutton Coldfield, Birmingham B75 7PJ

- 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 Matt Newman against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/07267/PA, dated 23 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is extension of bay window to a connecting porch, with pitched roof on the front of the property. No more than 1200x7000.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an end of terrace property within a residential area to the south of Rectory Road which is characterised by a mix of terraced and semi-detached houses. More recent residential development exists on the northern side of Rectory Road. Properties nearby are generally well set back from the road and areas of open green space and grassed verges give the area a spacious character. The hipped roofs, linear building form and limited material palette give a degree of consistency, despite several alterations and additions to dwellings which have taken place in the area.
4. The appeal property is part of a terrace of four, the front elevation of which is symmetrical in terms of its form and window and door arrangement. In common with the property at the western end of the terrace, it has a bay window to the ground floor which adds visual interest and a traditional appearance to the front elevation. Both alone, and as part of the group, the appeal property makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposal would involve the extension of the bay window to form a single storey, pitched roof, front extension which would be almost the width of the house. Whilst the extension would not project further forward than the existing bay window it would result in its loss as a traditional feature of the property and consequently the terrace would lose its characteristic symmetry. Furthermore, due to its width, combined with its prominent position on the front elevation, the extension would be a dominant addition to the property which would jar with its traditional proportions.

6. The elevations of the extension would be glazed above a low wall, with double doors. Due to the extent of the glazing the extension would contrast with the design and materials of the host dwelling and would appear particularly incongruous in this context.
7. During my site visit I noted several other examples of single storey front extensions in the area and some of these were drawn to my attention by the appellant in support of the appeal. These vary in design and form, however I saw no examples which have the same design and extent of glazing as the appeal scheme. Some of the extensions incorporate a bay window and some are not within a symmetrical terrace. Notwithstanding the other examples, these are limited in number and front extensions are not generally characteristic of the area.
8. I have not been provided with the full details of these examples and I cannot be certain that they represent a direct comparison to the appeal scheme. Nevertheless, I acknowledge that these extensions add to the variety of building forms in the area, and I have taken this into account in coming to my decision.
9. I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan (January 2017), the Birmingham Design Guide (September 2022) and relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework. Together these seek to ensure that development demonstrates high design quality, reinforces local distinctiveness, and responds to local context. The reasons for refusal refer to Policy DM2 of the Development Management in Birmingham Development Plan Document (December 2021) however this Policy does not relate to character and appearance and as such is not determinative in this case.

Conclusion

10. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole, and there are no material considerations, including the Framework, that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

E Pickernell

INSPECTOR