



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2025

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/24/3353499

146-148 Barrows Road, Sparkbrook, Birmingham, B11 1TL

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr. M Fayyaz against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/03602/PA.
 - The development is single-storey extension to both houses.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Since the determination of the application the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) has been superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (the Framework). However, in relation to this appeal the aims of both sets of policies are similar. No party would be prejudiced or caused any injustice by me proceeding with the appeal in light of this change in policy.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises two properties which are within a predominantly residential area. In general, there is a harmony to the design of properties in the immediate area, with two storey rear outriggers with single storey projections a noticeable feature.
5. I observed during my site visit that some single storey rear projections had been extended and a limited number at a similar length to the proposal before me. The proposed extensions would follow the pitch of their respective two storey outriggers however at a slightly different angle, infilling most of the space between appeal properties.
6. The proposed development would retain an alleyway between the appeal properties and due to the design of the proposal would create a gull-wing roof design with limited separation. The height, mass and design of both extensions adjacent to shared boundaries with other properties which would

not be extended would look out of keeping with the area and be dominant features.

7. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area.
8. There is conflict with Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan (2017) and Policy DM2 of the Birmingham Development Plan Document (2021) which seeks amongst other things to ensure developments create an attractive and high quality development appropriate to its location.
9. There is also conflict with the Birmingham Design Guide Supplementary Plan Document (2022) (the SPD) which amongst other things seek to ensure development respect the appearance of a property and local area.
10. There is conflict with the Framework which seeks amongst other things to ensure developments are of good design appropriate and sympathetic to their surroundings.
11. The appellant has drawn my attention to the approval of extensions within the area. Limited information has been submitted to allow comparison to the proposal before me, however I do note that most relate to a single property. Notwithstanding this each development must be considered on its individual merits, and I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal.

Other Matters

12. Whilst the Council have not raised the effect of living conditions on existing or future occupiers of the appeal site properties as an issue, I do note that windows would face each other with limited separation. I understand that the appellant owns both properties, nevertheless this may not always be the case.
13. The close proximity of windows along with the limited level of light which would be able to enter these rooms would create a sense of enclosure. Notwithstanding my concern relating to the effect of the development on living conditions of existing or future occupiers this has not influenced my decision in terms of this appeal.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR