



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 January 2020 by S Watson BA(Hons) MSc

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/19/3239871

114 Northfield Road, Harborne, Birmingham B17 0TA

- 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 Michael Hahn against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/06420/PA, dated 20 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is workshop/hobby/store building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is located on an access road serving a row of residential dwellings on the west side of Northfield Road. The houses and access road follow a curve and are separated from the main road by a grass verge. The houses form a strong building line and are set significantly higher than both the access and main roads. The appeal site itself is at the south end of the row and is one of the closest to Northfield Road. The site contains a semi-detached dwelling with a driveway across part of the frontage. To the south of the driveway are mature trees which form a boundary with the residential gardens backing on the appeal site, and the main road to the east.
5. The front gardens serving the properties along this stretch of Northfield Road have been left open with a variety of soft and hard landscaping creating terraces giving the area an attractive appearance. Although the appeal site is already somewhat different from these due to the driveway, the open character of the site has been retained.

6. The proposed outbuilding would be sited in the south-east corner of the site between the house and road. It would be located to the side and front of the host property and would as a result of its siting and scale be highly prominent in the street scene, which would draw attention to this incongruous form of development. The use of matching materials would not mitigate the identified harm. The presence of trees along the boundary of the site would reduce the visual impact of the proposal from a southerly direction but from the north and east the new building would be highly visible. Such landscaping features would not therefore mitigate the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area.
7. In all I conclude that the proposal would be an intrusive feature in the streetscene which would result in significant harm being caused to the character and appearance of the area. The contribution that the appeal site makes to the attractive appearance of the area would be significantly diminished as a result. The proposal would therefore conflict with the character and appearance aims of Policy PG3 of the *Birmingham Plan 2031: Birmingham Development Plan*, Policies 3.14C-D of the *Birmingham Plan: Birmingham Unitary Development Plan*, and the National Planning Policy Framework which jointly seek for development to be of a high design quality which contributes to a strong sense of place.

Conclusion and Recommendation

8. For the reasons given above I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Watson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

9. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and concur that the appeal should be dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR