



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2024

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19.01.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/23/3334311

702 Bordesley Green, Birmingham, B9 5PQ

- 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 Muhaned Saleh against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2023/05296/PA, dated 2 August 2023, was refused by notice dated 19 October 2023.
 - The development proposed is single storey front porch extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The section of Bordesley Green in which the appeal site is located is mainly residential with a mix of terraced, semi-detached and some detached housing. Designs vary, but pairs of houses and houses within terraces share common design features. Ground floor bay windows and 2 storey bays are common within the area.
4. The appeal site relates to one of four, mid-terraced, 2 storey houses. Pairs of houses share a recessed arched porch, and they all have ground floor bay windows which align with the first floor windows above and have five panes of glass. The bay windows and porches provide an element of symmetry and rhythm to the front elevation of the terrace, as does the common building line.
5. The Birmingham Design Guide (2022) (BDG) advises that front extensions will not be acceptable unless they improve the appearance of the host property and should be set behind or align with its established building line.
6. The proposed development would extend part of the front ground floor such that it would project forward to approximately the same extent as the existing bay window. It would be wider than the existing bay, extending to the side of the porch, and have a hipped roof. A new bay window would be added to it, effectively extending the bay approximately 0.9m forward of its current position. Instead of a flat roof, the bay window roof would extend up to just below the ridge on the roof of the extended ground floor wall.

7. The wider ground floor extension would be out of character with other houses within the terrace whose bay windows are set in from the shared porch and extend directly from the main wall of the house. It would add another roof structure at ground floor level and thus appear incongruous. It would also draw attention to the new bay extending beyond the building line of other bays within the terrace.
8. I appreciate that the design matches that of the proposal at No 704, which was also refused and is subject of a separate appeal. In so doing, the appellant has attempted to provide some consistency and balance in the design. Nonetheless, it would interrupt the existing building line and upset the design symmetry and rhythm of the wider terrace and thus harm the character and appearance of the host property and the area. The proposed development would therefore conflict with Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan (2017), Policy DM2 of the Development Management in Birmingham Development Plan Document (2021), the BDG and the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) which require high quality design that reinforces local distinctiveness and complements the character of the host building and its surroundings.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR