



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 27 July 2021

by Samuel Watson BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/W/21/3273056
112 Holland Road, Sutton Coldfield B72 1RE

- 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 Chris Adams against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref 2020/07004/PA, dated 4 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is the creation of 2no. self-contained apartments on upper floors, erection of single storey, first and second floor rear extension and new access stairs.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description above has been taken from the appeal form as it is clearer and more precise than that used in the application form. I note this description was also used by the Council in their decision notice. My use of this description does not, having considered the proposed plans, fundamentally change the development for which planning permission is sought.
3. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021. I have determined this appeal in the context of the revised Framework, on which the parties have been given the opportunity to comment.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a two storey end terraced property. It is finished in red brick with Tudor detailing to the upper floor. The scale and detailing of the building reflect the traditional design of the terrace, of which there are more than one along this side of Holland Road. There is a subservient but long single storey rear extension running along the back edge of the pavement on Holland Street. There is some more modern development to the opposite side of Holland Road which is read separately to the aforementioned terraces.
6. The first floor element of the proposed rear extension, owing to its design, size, height and overall bulk, would fail to reflect the pleasant traditional proportions of the host building. The flat roof in particular, as it would cut into the side gable, would be particularly intrusive in this regard. In addition, the mix of

different roof forms in the extensions would result in a confused side and rear elevation without a clear identity. The use of a round window would also appear anomalous in a jarring way when compared to other windows in both the existing building and the proposed extensions.

7. Some changes, such as the second floor window in the two storey extension and the changes to the front elevation would be in keeping with the more traditional design features of the building and the wider terrace. The appeal building also displays some tired elements in need of attention and in some respects the use of modern design elements may add some colour and feature to the area in and around the local school. However, these matters would not be sufficient to make the appeal scheme acceptable and, should repairs and cosmetic improvements be needed for the building, that does not have to be via the design and scale of the scheme before me.
8. For the reasons I have given, when taking the proposed extensions and alterations as a whole, they would dominate the host building and accordingly appear stark and incongruous to the traditional design quality of the building and the wider terrace. They would therefore cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. This would result in conflict with Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Plan 2031: Birmingham Development Plan and saved Paragraphs 3.14C-D of The Birmingham Plan: Birmingham Unitary Development Plan 2005. These policies, amongst other matters require that development is of a high quality design which respects its surroundings and contributes towards a positive sense of place. The proposal would also conflict with the design guidance contained within Places for Living and Places for All Supplementary Planning Guidance documents and the overarching design aims of the Framework.
9. In light of the above, I find the proposal would, by way of its scale, form and appearance be a prominent and incongruous feature that dominates the rear and side elevations of the host dwelling. As such the contribution the dwelling makes towards the street scene would be harmed to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.

Other Matters

10. While the proposal may provide sufficient parking to accommodate the increase in occupiers, this is not a benefit of the scheme and as such I attach only limited weight to it. Likewise, while it has been suggested that the proposal would make more efficient use of the host building, it has not been demonstrated that this is the case. Therefore, lacking evidence to the contrary, this matter can only attract little weight.
11. I note that it is not the appellant's intention to create a pastiche of the host dwelling. While a discrete design can help protect the legibility of the original building from a new extension, in this case and for the reasons I have given the proposal would not protect the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Conclusion

12. The government's objective is to significantly boost the supply of housing and the proposal would provide two flats in a location with adequate access to services. Given the small scale of the proposal and that there is no dispute over

the Council demonstrating a five-year housing land supply, the provision of the additional housing attracts modest weight.

13. Conversely, the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. This matter attracts significant weight and, in my view, outweighs the benefits associated with the proposed development.
14. Therefore, and for the reasons above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that outweigh this conflict. As such, the appeal should be dismissed.

Samuel Watson

INSPECTOR