



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2019 by S Watson BA(Hons) MSc

Decision by Kenneth Stone BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/W/19/3239697

Rear of 188, Walsall Road, Four Oaks, Sutton Coldfield, West Midlands B74 4RH

- 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 Frank Howard against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2019/05575/PA, dated 2 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 28 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is conversion of existing garage and extension to create a dwelling.
-

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 surrounding residential area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is on the south side of Edge Hill Road, a residential street characterised primarily by detached, two-storey dwellings set within spacious, verdant plots. Although the properties are of varied styles and ages, they predominantly share a similar hipped roof form, the main exception being the detached bungalow at No 188 Walsall Road. The character at the eastern end of the road changes significantly but due to the distance from the appeal site I give this little weight. The appeal site itself forms part of the garden serving 188 Walsall Road and contains a single storey detached garage. The proposal would result in a dormer bungalow, with accommodation in the roof space, set towards the back of the plot with parking and a private garden to the front and side.
5. The proposed dwelling would be detached from neighbouring properties and set back from the highway, which along with the adjacent substation would

maintain space at the front and either side. In this way although the plot itself is considerably smaller than is typical for the street, the proposal would retain a sense of spaciousness and be sympathetic to the character of the street scene, when viewed from the street. Although the proposal accommodates a forward projecting element beyond the main building line on Edge Hill Road, this would only be a single storey extension which would be of a similar scale to those on neighbouring properties. Moreover, given the depth of the dwelling's setback any impact on the building line would be further reduced. In light of the above, and as there would only be limited changes to the frontage, the spacious appearance of the site within the street scene would largely be retained.

6. The appearance of the proposed bungalow, particularly the substantial roof slopes, gabled roof and long, low dormer are not characteristic of Edge Hill Road and would be prominent features which would result in harm to the character and appearance of the street. No 188 Walsall Road is not read in relation to the street scene of Edge Hill Road, in part due to the large garden which separates it from the neighbouring properties on this road. Therefore, although the appellant has sought to use design cues from both streets, the design is not sympathetic to the character and appearance of Edge Hill Road, within which it would most readily be read, and it would therefore appear incongruous.
7. In conclusion the proposed dwelling would, by way of its design, be out of keeping with and therefore harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding residential area. The proposal would not comply with the character and appearance aims of Policies PG3 and TP27 of the *Birmingham Plan 2031: Birmingham Development Plan* (BDP), saved Paragraph 3.14D of *The Birmingham Plan: Birmingham Unitary Development Plan*, and the guidance contained within the *Places for Living* supplementary planning guidance, *Mature Suburbs – Guidelines to Control Residential Intensification* supplementary planning document, and Paragraphs 127 b), c) and d) of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

Other Matters

8. I acknowledge that the proposed new dwelling would comply with the locational strategy of Policy TP28 and the sustainability aims of Policy TP30, as raised by the appellant¹. Nevertheless, I find that these matters do not outweigh the harm identified above. Equally, although the proposed dwelling would increase the use of the appeal site, as is supported by the Framework, this also does not outweigh the above harm.
9. My attention has been directed to Parkfields, a recent residential development set off Edge Hill Road. I find that the situation at Parkfields is significantly different to the appeal site and I am not aware of the circumstances under which it was approved. Moreover, all proposals must be considered on their own merits and I therefore give this development very little weight in the determination of this appeal.
10. Given the limited evidence to support the appellant's statement that the Council cannot meet their housing land supply I find it unlikely to be the case.

¹ Although the appellant refers to these policies being part of the *Birmingham Local Plan* it appears that they are actually from the BDP.

Nevertheless, I find that the benefits of one additional dwelling would be very limited and would be outweighed by the harm identified above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

S Watson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Kenneth Stone

INSPECTOR