



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2019

by M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/W/19/3233758

29 Redacre Road, Sutton Coldfield, West Midlands B73 5EE

- 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 Damien Duignan against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2018/08507/PA, dated 18 October 2018, was refused by notice dated 19 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a 'new building dwelling – 3 bedroom unit'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed dwelling on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two-storey semi-detached house and its garden situated on Redacre Road at its junction with Ivy Road. The existing dwelling is typical of the surrounding established residential area, which is characterised by inter-war semi-detached and detached houses set in deep plots. Front gardens are reasonably spacious, and frontages along both Redacre Road and Ivy Road are largely set to a uniform building line. The generous rear gardens, mature trees and other planting contribute to the wider area's leafy and spacious character. This is especially apparent at corner plots where rear gardens adjoin the street, and where the width and depth of the plots provides areas free of development which adds to the sense of spaciousness.
4. The proposal would sub-divide the existing plot and demolish No 29's existing single-storey side extension to enable the erection of a new two-storey detached dwelling within the garden. Although its flank wall would align with the existing houses on Redacre Road, its frontage would be on Ivy Road.
5. Both the existing side extension to No 29 and the adjacent outbuilding are modest in height, and well-screened by the boundary fence and vegetation. The trees along the boundary also contribute to the area's verdant appearance. By contrast a two-storey dwelling would be taller and bulkier, and would intrude into the valuable corner space. Its proximity to the footway of Ivy Road would further diminish the sense of sense of spaciousness at the street junction

and would appear cramped in the context of the area. It would consequently be harmful to the character of the area.

6. The new dwelling would sit forward of the building line which characterises Ivy Road. It would close off views along the street, which would be very apparent because of the gentle curve and fall in level when approaching the appeal site along Ivy Road. It would therefore be at odds with the prevailing pattern of development and harmful to the street's spacious character. While the proposed dwelling would maintain the established building line on Redacre Road and so would not appear intrusive in longer views along that street, this would not outweigh its detrimental effect on Ivy Road.
7. I accept that there is no objection in principle to residential development on the site and, if acceptable, it could help to make efficient use of land. However, although the style, design and materials of the new dwelling would be compatible with its context, I have found that the proposal would be harmful because of its siting in relation to the surrounding development. My attention has also been drawn to other cases nearby where houses have been built or approved on plots at the side of existing dwellings. I note that the example provided on Ivy Road maintains the building line along that street, while the example at the western end of Redacre Road has a different relationship with Oakwood Road because of the curve of that road. Neither of these examples is therefore directly comparable with this proposal, which I have assessed on its own merits.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed dwelling would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan 2017 and would not comply with guidance in the 2008 'Mature suburbs – guidelines to control residential intensification' Supplementary Planning Document, which together seek to ensure that new development reinforces a positive sense of place and responds to local context and distinctiveness. It would also fail to accord with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular paragraphs 127 and 130 which seek to achieve well-designed places.

Other matters

9. The proposed dwelling would be in an accessible location with a range of local services nearby, and would make a modest contribution to increasing housing supply. It would have adequate internal and external space, and the windows of habitable rooms would be sufficiently separated from neighbouring dwellings to ensure that there would not be a harmful degree of overlooking or overshadowing. I note also that there were no objections to the proposal from neighbours. However, these factors do not diminish the detrimental effect the development would have on the character and appearance of the area, nor do they justify permitting a development which I have found to be harmful.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

M Cryan

Inspector