
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 April 2017

by B Bowker Mplan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 12 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/W/17/3166979

345 College Road, Kingstanding, Birmingham B44 0HF

- 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 R Williams against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2016/07560/PA, dated 20 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is new build adjacent to 345 College Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appellant has confirmed that the name provided within the planning application form included a minor typographical error. Consequently, the name as clarified and as provided in the appeal form is used above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The proposed dwelling would be located to the side of No 345 College Road. Nos 345 – 339 is a residential terrace located to the east of a terrace (nos 351 – 357) that is similar in appearance and scale. The similar appearance of both terraces gives the site and its immediate surroundings, particularly at the junction of College Road and Lydham Close, a pleasant spacious and ordered appearance that is noticeable from public vantage points to the immediate north and south.
 5. Despite being set back from the front building line of No 345 and adopting a matching hipped roof design, the proposal would reduce the spacious character of the surrounding area. This loss of spaciousness would be appreciable from public vantage points at the adjoining sections of College Road and Lydham Close.
 6. Irrespective of the proposed matching wall, roof and window details, the proposal would result in the host terrace being larger in width and therefore unbalanced in appearance when viewed alongside the adjacent terrace. As a consequence, the proposal would unacceptably harm the ordered character of the immediate vicinity.
-

7. Therefore I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Consequently the proposal would be contrary to Unitary Development Plan policies 3.8 and 3.10 and section 7 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Combined these policies require development to be of a good design that protects what is good in the City's environment and improves what is less good.

Other matters

8. I acknowledge that the proposal would make a modest windfall contribution to housing supply, contribute to local services, support the vitality and viability of Kingstanding and improve access arrangements at the site. However, these modest benefits would be outweighed by the harm identified above.
9. I also note the appellant received a favourable response to the proposal at pre application stage. However, it is common practice that informal advice given regarding an application is done so without prejudice and cannot pre-determine the outcome of a subsequent application.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and having taken all matters raised into account, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

B Bowker

INSPECTOR