



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/24/3338686

49 Grestone Avenue, Birmingham B20 1AR

- 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 & Mrs J and H Singh and Kaur against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2023/06896/PA, dated 9 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 5 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single storey side 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 semi-detached dwelling located in a corner position next to the junction of Grestone Avenue and Ashcombe Avenue. The area includes large semi-dwellings of a similar age which are set back from the highway. The space between the new side extension constructed at the appeal dwelling and its boundary with Ashcombe Avenue is a strip of open land. At the opposite corner of the road junction the side elevation of the dwelling of 55 Grestone Avenue is also set back from Ashcombe Avenue, with some tree cover present, adding to the open character of development at this road junction and providing some visual relief from the built development.
4. The Council considers that the proposed extension would have no adverse impact on the amenity of neighbours. I see no reason to disagree, given that it would be located at the side of the dwelling next to Ashcombe Avenue. Accordingly, the proposal would not conflict with policy DM2 of the Development Management in Birmingham Development Plan Document.
5. The Council considers that the proposal would significantly unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties. I agree with the appellant that there is already a degree of unbalance and loss of symmetry from previous extensions. There would be sufficient garden space left at the rear of the building and space for frontage parking. However, although the proposed extension would only be single storey, and would be set back from the front elevation of the dwelling, it would be a prominent, incongruous addition in this corner location. It would

appear out of scale with the bulk and mass of the newly extended dwelling. It would also significantly reduce the open character of development at the road junction by taking up the space between the dwelling and the boundary with Ashcombe Avenue. Although a relatively open frontage would be retained to Grestone Avenue, it would be insufficient to counteract the harm from the proposed extension.

6. I find that the proposal would be significantly harmful to the character and appearance of the building and street scene. It would 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. It would also conflict with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework regarding good design.

Other Matters

7. The appellant has drawn my attention to other examples of single and two-storey side extensions at corner plots in the area. However, the circumstances are not identical, and I consider that they form insufficient precedence to allow harmful development at the appeal site.
8. The appellant submits that proposed extension would make use of existing land at the property, provide further living space for existing and future occupants, including the appellant's mother, and improve the functionality and accessibility of the property. There would be some additional economic benefits regarding employment during the construction phase, albeit limited and the extension would be designed to be energy efficient. Nevertheless, in terms of sustainability, the proposal would not meet the environmental objectives of the Framework because of the harm from the loss of space at the side of the dwelling in this corner position. Overall, these claimed benefits would not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the building and street scene which I have identified from the proposed extension.

Conclusion

9. I have taken all other matters raised into account. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR