

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 December 2023

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/23/3332092

1 Waltham Grove, Birmingham, B44 0SU

- 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 Miss Vesela Emilova Mihaylova against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2023/05884/PA, dated 25 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 24 October 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side extension with new porch entrance.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the proposed development is taken from the application form. The Council's decision notice describes the development as "erection of single storey front, side and rear extension."

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling situated in a prominent corner location, at the entrance to Waltham Grove, a cul-de-sac, from Twickenham Road.
 5. The appeal property is set back from the road behind a wide area of pavement, with dropped kerbs providing for on-pavement car parking. The dwelling is set back from the pavement behind a garden area which fronts both Waltham Grove and Twickenham Road.
 6. The proposed development the subject of this appeal seeks to replace a single storey flat-roofed structure attached to the side of the dwelling at an oblique angle and described by the appellant as being ramshackle.
 7. This single storey element includes a small garage and is unprepossessing, being low in height and modest in scale. Further, it is set back from the road and this together with the local topography, such that houses further along
-

Waltham Grove are situated at a higher level, serves to prevent this unassuming structure of modest scale from drawing undue attention to itself.

8. The surrounding area is residential and is characterised by the presence of two storey semi-detached and terraced dwellings. The common use of brick and tiles, the setting back of dwellings from the road and similar features, including hipped roofs, lends the area a satisfying sense of uniformity. Further, the presence of front gardens, hedgerows, the wide pavements and glimpses through to trees and rear gardens, all combine to provide for a spacious character and a sense of greenery.
9. In addition to the above, during my site visit I noted that, whilst many dwellings have been altered and or extended, such changes generally appear in keeping with their surroundings and this is a contributing factor to the area's uniform qualities.
10. Whilst an element of the proposed development would result in the replacement of what the appellant describes as a dilapidated structure, I consider that the benefits arising from this would, to some considerable degree, be negated by the proposed access arrangement, whereby a new porch area would project forwards for a considerable distance in a prominent location.
11. I find that the resultant porch would appear overly large. It would unduly dominate the appearance of the front of the house, and it would appear awkward against the oblique angle of the rest of the extension.
12. The harm arising as a result of this would be exacerbated as a result of the proposed porch stepping well forward of the building line along this side of Waltham Grove. In this way, an unassuming ground floor extension would be replaced by a development that would draw the eye and would appear unlike and visually jar with, the appearance of neighbouring dwellings.
13. Given all of the above, I find that the proposal would appear out of character with its surroundings. Taking this and all of the above into account, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan (2017); to Policy DM2 of the Development Management in Birmingham DPD (Development Plan Document) (2021); and to the Birmingham Design Guide SPD (Supplementary Planning Document) (2022), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR