



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 June 2020 by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

Decision by Kenneth Stone BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Q4625/W/20/3245550

17 Bradbury Road, Solihull B92 8AE

- 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 Neil Hughes against the decision of Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref: PL/2019/02165/PPFL, dated 14 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as 'one detached house built on land to the side of 17. Bradbury Road.'
-

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 effect of the proposed development upon the character of the area and appearance of the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is the side garden for No.17 Bradbury Road which is located at the end of the road in front of a cul-de-sac development. The site is currently bound by wooden fencing to the side and rear and there are a number of trees along the rear boundary of the site. No.17 is a semi-detached house with a two-storey bay window column, set within a spacious plot, as are the majority of dwellings within the street scene. The dwellings on Bradbury Road are typically set behind front gardens or off-street parking and this contributes to the open suburban appearance of the street scene.
5. The proposed dwelling would be a two storey detached house with a two storey bay window column and would have a hipped roof which would match the appearance of the dwellings within the street scene, although No.17, as well as a number of other dwellings, has had a hip to gable roof extension.
6. The Council's House Extension Guidelines Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (Adopted 2009) notes that areas of open space on road corners and alongside properties are very important to the appearance of the area and the

Council will generally not allow them to be incorporated into a scheme. Whilst the SPD provides guidance for extensions, the purpose of the SPD is still relevant to the proposal before me because the site is on the corner of a road alongside a property. Whilst the site is partially bound by fencing because it is undeveloped the site does contribute to the open character of the area because there are views through the site, as well as of the mature trees to the rear. As noted earlier, the front gardens and off-street parking contributes to the open appearance of the street scene and the site in its current guise does contribute towards this attractive quality of the area.

7. Because the side elevation of No.17 is set back from the roadside by a reasonable distance, the dwelling, combined with the trees and fencing has a suburban appearance that does not appear overbearing to pedestrians using the footpath or other road users. The proposed dwelling would be located very close to the boundary of the site adjacent to the footpath and because it would be two storeys tall, the dwelling would appear more overbearing with a less suburban appearance compared to the existing appearance of the site. The view through the site of the surrounding development would also be replaced by a two-storey dwelling and this would detract from the open appearance of the site which is an important characteristic of the street scene.
8. The prevailing pattern of development within the street scene is of semi-detached dwellings that share a similar appearance. There is a single detached dwelling at the end of Bradbury Road but the other dwellings on Bradbury Road within the immediate street scene are semi-detached. Whilst this detached dwelling is part of the street scene the dwelling does not constitute an example of development that is consistent with the rhythm of the development in the street scene and is not something that should be repeated. The proposed dwelling would be a narrow-detached property built close to the roadside and would appear shoehorned into the available space. Whilst some attempt has been made to replicate the design of surrounding properties, including the hipped roof and bay window column, the proportions of the dwelling would appear compressed and cramped in comparison to the generally wider and more spacious appearance of the neighbouring semi-detached dwellings.
9. The Council cannot identify a 5-year housing land supply and consequently, policy P5 of the Solihull Local Plan Shaping a Sustainable Future (Adopted 2013) (LP) is considered to be out of date. Policy P15 requires development proposals to achieve good quality, inclusive and sustainable design and this policy is not out of date and full weight can be attributed to the aims of this policy in so far as it is relatable to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework). The proposed development would be contrary to Policy P15 because the proposed dwelling would be an incongruous addition that would harm the attractive, open appearance of the street scene. The proposal would also be contrary to the New Housing in Context Supplementary Planning Guidance (Adopted 2003) (SPG) in so far as it seeks to ensure that new housing enhances local character and is of good design. The proposal would also be contrary to the SPD and the Framework insofar as they require development to function well and add to the overall quality of the area.

Other Matters

10. Both parties have identified a number of similar applications and appeals. The majority of these schemes are located on different roads and consequently the relevance of those proposals to this scheme is limited. It is also important to note that each case must be assessed on their own merits and the Council approving a similar scheme elsewhere would not justify this proposal.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. The proposed dwelling would be located in a sustainable location and the Council cannot currently identify a 5-year housing land supply and the provision of a single dwelling would contribute to addressing the supply shortfall. Nevertheless, a single dwelling would make only a minor contribution to addressing this shortfall and I therefore give only limited weight to this. The siting and scale of the proposed dwelling would cause harm to the character and appearance of the street scene, contrary to the relevant policies of the development plan and I give substantial weight to that harm. Given the lack of a 5-year housing land supply the tilted balance, under paragraph 11d(ii) of the Framework is engaged. I am satisfied that the adverse impacts of the proposed development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the identified benefits of the scheme when assessed against the Framework when taken as a whole. Overall the scheme conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations that indicate a decision otherwise would be appropriate and therefore planning permission should be refused.
12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Sibley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I too agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

Kenneth Stone

INSPECTOR