



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 April 2024

by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15.05.2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/24/3337835

145 Hasbury Road, Woodgate, Birmingham B32 4DY

- 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 Z Shazad against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2023/06460/PA, dated 30 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 22 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side and rear extension with single storey forward extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a two-storey dwelling located at the end of a terrace of four properties of similar original form and design. It has a relatively large rear garden. There is lock-up parking area next to the side of the appeal dwelling with a 2-metre-high brick frontage wall and backdrop of an overhead electricity pylon. Hasbury Road has two-storey semi-detached dwellings and terraced housing.
4. The Council has identified no adverse impact from the proposal on the amenity of neighbours. I see no reason to disagree in view of its setting and taking into account the rear extension at the neighbouring dwelling of 147 Hasbury Road. There would be no conflict with policy DM2 of the Development Management in Birmingham Development Plan Document, which seeks to protect residential amenity.
5. The proposed two storey side extension would significantly increase the width of the front elevation of the building. It would be set-back at first floor level. The ridge line of the extension would also be set down from that of the house. The two-storey rear extension would splay when it met the boundary of the property with the parking area. However, because of the scale of the development the extensions would not appear subservient to the building.
6. The appeal building is located in an elevated position on a hillside and because it is at the end of the terrace, next to the more open site occupied by the lock-

up parking space, the proposed extensions would appear visually prominent when viewed from Hasbury Road. The extension would look unduly large and out of scale and would significantly reduce the open character of the plot. The splayed design would make the extension appear incongruous and out of character with the building and terrace and would result in an awkward internal room layout.

7. I find that the proposed extension would have a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building and street scene. It would therefore conflict with Birmingham Development Plan policy PG3 which seeks to ensure that all new development demonstrates high design quality and contributes to a strong sense of place. It would fail to comply with the Birmingham Design Guide which indicates that designs which negatively impact on the appearance of a property and surrounding area will not be supported, and that side and rear extensions should not dominate the appearance of the whole house. It would also conflict with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework regarding good design.

Other Matters

8. The appellant submits that the development would help meet the city demand for 4 bed homes and family accommodation needs. However, the contribution to the housing supply would only be limited and it is possible there could be other ways of extending the dwelling. The appellant has referred to other examples of side extensions in the vicinity, including splayed designs. Nevertheless, the extension proposed in this appeal would have significant size and mass and the splayed design would be overly prominent, in view of the partly open setting of the dwelling as an end of terrace property. Although the appellant has suggested planning conditions, including the use of matching materials, these matters would not overcome the harm to the character and appearance of the building and street scene that I have identified above.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR