

## Report for Information

### Appeal made against the refusal of planning permission

<b>Appeal reference</b>	APP/P1805/D/12/2173759
<b>Planning application</b>	12/0021
<b>Proposal</b>	Two storey side and single storey rear extension
<b>Location</b>	7 Sandhills Road, Barnt green, Birmingham
<b>Ward</b>	Hillside
<b>Decision</b>	Dismissed

The author of this report is Ruth Lambert who can be contacted on extension 1373 (e-mail: [r.lambert@bromsgrove.gov.uk](mailto:r.lambert@bromsgrove.gov.uk)) for more information.

### Discussion

The proposal relates to a two storey side extension to provide additional bedroom and re positioned bathroom. Single storey rear extension to provide open plan kitchen/diner, cloakroom and utility room

The application was determined under delegated powers and refused due to the following reason as detailed below;

1. The proposed extension would not be considered acceptable in terms of it being contrary to policy SPG1 Residential Design Guide in terms of it creating a cramped affect within the plot due to its design and overdevelopment in terms of the visual amenity of the street scene which would be contrary to policies S10 and DS13 of the BDLP, policy SD.2 of the WCSP and the general provisions of PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development.

The Inspector found the main issue of the appeal to be;

The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The appeal house is situated in a residential road which contains a variety of individual house types and styles. These include some terraced houses, but these are not situated in close proximity to the appeal property.

### Discussion

The appeal dwelling comprises a semi-detached house which dates from 1901.

The property includes a driveway alongside the house which provides a gap in development between the appeal house and the house at the adjacent property, No 5 Sandhills Road, which dates from the 1950s. The gap is visible

for some length along Sandhills Road to the west, mainly due to the gap in the roofs of the two houses.

The proposed extension would fill the majority of the gap between the two houses. This would create a cramped and terracing effect in conflict with the Council's SPG1, which seeks to ensure that a gap of 1m remains between extensions and the side boundaries of residential plots. This effect would occur notwithstanding that a gap would remain to the house at No 5.

The terracing effect would result in a significant change to the basic character of the original building in conflict with Local Plan (LP) Saved Policy S10. Furthermore, it would have a detrimental impact on local distinctiveness and would not protect the character of the settlement in conflict with Structure Plan Saved Policy SD.2 and LP Saved Policy DS13 respectively.

There are differences in style and character between the appeal house and that at No 5. Their overall form and height are however similar when seen along Sandhills Road, and these differences would not prevent the terracing effect already identified. The extension would be set back from the front elevation of the appeal house, but would be generally in line with that of the house at No 5.

This stagger in the front building line, and indeed a nearby boundary hedge, would not however prevent the terracing effect. Other examples of similar, and indeed narrower, gaps between dwellings exist in the surrounding area. These would however have no bearing on the specific impact of the proposal, and therefore do not add weight in support of the proposal.

I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. I further conclude that it would thus conflict with Local Plan Saved Policies S10 and DS13 and Structure Plan Saved Policy SD.2.

The proposal would also restrict outside access to the rear of the appeal property. This would have a negative impact on the living conditions of occupiers, and this adds weight to the harm already identified. The appellant has suggested that a narrower first floor element of the extension, as suggested by the Council, would result in the additional accommodation within the appeal house being of little use. The advantages of the width of the proposed accommodation would not however outweigh the harm identified. Furthermore, the fact that no local objection has been made to the proposal would not overcome the harm identified.

The policies in the Framework have been considered but, in the light of the facts of this case, they do not alter the conclusion. Having also taken into account all other matters raised, none carry sufficient weight to alter the decision. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

### **Conclusion**

The policies in the Framework have been considered but, in the light of the facts of this case, they do not alter the conclusion. Having also taken into account all other matters raised, none carry sufficient weight to alter the decision. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Therefore the Inspector dismissed the appeal

### **Appeal outcome**

The appeal was **dismissed**

### **Costs application**

No application for costs was made.