
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 April 2025

by **S Simms BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/W/25/3359450

99 Beaumont Road, Birmingham B30 2EB

- 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 Mrs Ikeeda Davis against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application ref. is 2024/05388/PA.
 - The development proposed is erection of two storey side and rear extension, single storey rear and front extensions, hip-to-gable roof conversion and installation of dormer window to rear and annexation of acquired commercial land into residential curtilage for use as garden and parking spaces.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the development on the:
 - character and appearance of the area
 - living conditions of future occupiers with particular regard to internal layout, outlook, and daylight
 - traffic flow and highway safety

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey detached house with a hipped roof and facing gable containing a bay window on the ground floor. A wooden lean-to shed adjoins the house to its left as seen from the street, behind which there is small flat-roofed side extension. The house appears to have been built later than the rest of the street and in a different style, having the only hipped roof. The site includes a plot of commercial land immediately behind the existing rear garden.
4. The plot to the left contains only hard surfaces that appear to have formed a floor or yard of a demolished building. Further to the left is a chapel with a terrace of Edwardian houses beyond. To the right of the site is a narrow-fronted detached house with large rear outrigger. Whilst most of the houses have outriggers, they tend to be of simple plan and roof form, set in from the side of the house.
5. Behind the site is a filling station on A4040 Linden Road, which runs at right angles to Beaumont Road and forms a junction with it a short distance away. The wider

area is a Victorian and Edwardian suburb of terraced streets that grew with the canal, railway and chocolate factory to the north-east.

6. The proposal would extend the left side of the house by just under a third of its width and extend the full resulting width at the rear, doubling the depth at ground floor, albeit stepped down with the land, and increasing it by half at first floor level. A single-storey front extension would infill the step-in from the facing gable.
7. The left and right roof hips would be converted to gables, and a dormer inserted almost the full width to the rear. The single storey rear extension would have a flat roof with lantern allowing natural light and the two-storey part would have two shallow gable roofs with a valley between. A mono-pitch roof over the front extension would contain a small facing gable over a mock Georgian door with full-height windows either side and a bay window to its left, all in white uPVC.
8. In properly matching materials, the side extension and roof conversion would not harm the appearance of the house as seen from Beaumont Road or its contribution to the character of that street, partly due to its already being unique in design and partly due to the prevailing roof types in the locality.
9. However, the front extension would disrupt the simple shapes and articulation of the existing house, introducing incongruous features and fenestration. The side of the rear extension and dormer would be visible from the street across the adjoining unbuilt plot, appearing bulky and out of scale with its neighbours.
10. The combination of the dormer and double gables, the pitch of which would differ from the main roof, is particularly odd. Despite being visible only from adjoining gardens and glimpsed from Linden Road – less public or more transient receptors – the harm is such that this also is unacceptable. Whilst I note the presence of dormers elsewhere on Beaumont Road, these are not as large in absolute terms and are not seen in conjunction with other, more complex roof forms.
11. The front, rear and roof extensions would harm the character and appearance of the area, therefore, contrary to Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan (2017), which expects design to respond to local context, and City Notes LW-16 and LW-18 of the Birmingham Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2022), which seek extensions that complement the scale and style of the house and do not dominate its roof. I attach significant weight to this conflict.

Living Conditions

12. Whilst the proposed Bedroom 2 exceeds the minimum area of 7.5m² for a single bedroom in the Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS), it is below the width standard of 2.15m for a single room. The proposed first floor Prayer Room would have a single window facing the side wall of 101 Beaumont Road at around 3m. Whilst I note that this is not proposed as a bedroom, it would be open to future occupiers to use it as such, and it would have inadequate daylight and outlook.
13. These two aspects of the proposed first floor layout would therefore fail to provide an adequate standard of living conditions for future occupiers, contrary to Policies DM2 and DM10 of the Development Management in Birmingham Development Plan Document (DPD) (2021) and City Note LW-11 of Birmingham Design Guide SPD (2022), which require both consideration of outlook and daylight, and for all development to comply with the NDSS. I attach significant weight to this conflict.

Traffic flow and Highway Safety

14. The Council's Transportation Department considers that the proposed parking spaces would have insufficient space on the adjacent access, into or out of which to turn. However, they are wider than standard and some way from the highway, so I am not convinced that this would result in highway safety issues.
15. Whilst described as shared, the access is excluded from the site boundary, leaving open whether the appellant has the right to use it. In any event, the site is in Zone C of the Council's Parking Standards SPD (2021), so there is no specific standard and an inability to use the spaces would not result in policy conflict.
16. Overall, I do not consider that the proposed parking layout is likely to result in any adverse impact on the free flow of traffic or highway safety along Beaumont Road. It would thus comply with Policies PG3 and TP44 of the Birmingham Development Plan, which require safe, functional spaces and transport networks.
17. Whilst I have not found harm in respect of this aspect of the proposal, that does not overcome the harms that I have identified in other aspects of the proposal.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

S Simms

INSPECTOR