



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2025

by **P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/25/3361007

85 Moor Pool Avenue, Birmingham, B17 9DS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Moira Bradwell against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/07342/PA.
 - The development proposed is Replace existing porch with timber double glazed windows and door and brickwork to match the current style with a new hipped roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Moor Pool, Harborne Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal house is the end property in a terrace of 4 houses. Roads in the area are tree lined and there are narrow grass verges between the road edge and pavement edge. Houses are set back behind front gardens and mostly planted with hedge boundaries which contribute to the verdant appearance of the area reflecting the garden suburb design, noted in the Moor Pool Estate Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan (2012) (CACAMP). There is some variation in house design within Moor Pool Avenue, but most share common features and use of materials that contribute to their historic interest and arts and crafts influenced design. They include 2 storey front gables which project out from the roof and are joined to that of neighbouring houses, exposed brickwork on the ground floor and rough cast cream render on the first floor, matching windows and doors, clay roof tiles and brick and clay pot chimney stacks and timber doors with 9 glass panels.
4. Unlike most houses on the area the appeal property has a front porch that projects forward of the house. It has a flat roof which is level with the top of the ground floor windows and is accessed from a side door which has a single glass panel, as does the front door. According to the council the porch likely pre-dates the CA designation and the CACAMP notes the cumulative negative effect that porches and changes to doors have had on the character of the CA. The existing porch appears at odds with houses elsewhere on Moor Pool Avenue and upsets the symmetry within the terrace.

5. The proposed replacement porch would have a hipped roof which would join the main roof where it drops down to level with the front gable string course between the ground and first floor. Consequently, it would be higher than the existing porch and although the roof tiles would match those of the main house roof, its hipped design would be at odds with the gabled features elsewhere on the house and others within the terrace and be a more obtrusive feature than the porch it would replace.
6. Given the small scale of the development within the context of the Conservation Area as a whole, it would not harm its character. There would however be harm in terms of its appearance. The harm would be localised, limited and less than substantial but would nevertheless be contrary to Policies PG3 and TP12 of the Birmingham Development Plan (2017) which require development to reinforce local distinctiveness and enhance heritage assets.
7. Any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset requires justification and, in accordance with paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024), I must weigh the harm against the public benefits of the proposal. There would be modest benefits arising from the improved condition and thermal performance of the porch. However, such benefits would not outweigh the harm to the appearance of the street scene and the Moor Pool, Harborne Conservation Area.

Conclusion

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

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR