
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025 by E Clifford BA (Hons) MA

Decision by F Wilkinson BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 December 2025.

Appeal Ref: APP/P4605/D/25/3370941

11 Farquhar Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham B15 3RA

- 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 Tamjid Mirza against the decision of Birmingham City Council.
 - The application ref is 2025/02179/PA.
 - The development proposed is an extension and alterations to existing dwelling
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. As the proposal is in a conservation area and relates to the setting of listed buildings, I have taken account of the duties within sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and local area bearing in mind the special regard that should be paid to the desirability of preserving the setting of the nearby Grade II listed buildings, 15 and 17 Farquhar Road, and the extent to which it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Edgbaston Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is a large, detached property sited on a generous plot. Built in the inter-war period, the dwelling features many of the characteristics of the stockbroker Tudor style, a sub-group of the wider Arts and Crafts movement; the building is two storeys with a steeply pitched tiled roof and gabled porch. There is also a large centrally placed chimney stack. The front elevation has a projecting double-height porch; this has mock-timber detailing enveloping herringbone brickwork and an oriel window with tile hung apron above a recessed main entrance. The property has two garages to the left-hand side which are presently accessed via the carriage driveway. The appeal property is set back from the highway beyond a low boundary wall, lawned area and flanking green spaces, and driveway and is partially screened by mature trees.

6. The appeal site lies within the boundaries of the Calthorpe Estate; established in the late C18 the area was protected from the construction of factories, warehouses or stopping points when the Worcester Canal was built through the area thereby preserving the residential and exclusive nature of the estate. The estate tightly controlled the size of building plots and architectural design creating a unique and characterful suburb of Birmingham. In the mid-C20, architect John Madin was instructed to prepare a masterplan for the future of the estate and developed a variety of high and low-density housing and a specific commercial quarter. As a result, the residential character has been preserved to the modern day, and there remains a wide variety of architectural styles and dwelling sizes making up the character and appearance of the area.
7. Along Farquhar Road, there is no unifying architectural style however the quality of the architectural design results in a varied and yet cohesive character to the area. Whilst not exemplar of all the dwellings, overarching features of the area includes red brick and gables, often paired with steeply pitched roofs. The dwellings sit in liberal, well-defined plots which enable the generous scale of the properties to not appear as cramped or overly closely set. This spacious nature contributes positively to the street scene and the conservation area.

Character and Appearance of the host dwelling

8. The proposed development would consist of the erection of a two-storey front, side, and rear extension, with additional single storey side and rear extensions and the installation of dormer windows to the rear of the appeal property.
9. The removal of the off-centre gabled porch and replacement with a larger, centrally placed version would noticeably harm the appeal property's characterful stockbroker Tudor appearance, as the current asymmetrical elevation is a positive feature of the style. Whilst I accept the appellant's point that the ridge line of the flanking wings would be lower than that of the original roofline, the excessive scale and width of the side extensions would fail to respect the considered design of the host dwelling and would not convey an acceptable sense of subserviency. The cumulative effect of the proposed design would therefore fail to preserve the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. The use of matching materials and features would not adequately mitigate this harm.
10. I accept the appellant's contention that the plot of the appeal site is generous, indeed more so than many along the road, and allows capacity for change. There are indeed other examples of properties extending to the full width of their plots, as would be the result of the proposed development on the appeal site. However, in this instance, the removal of the flanking green spaces, excessive scale of the proposal and removal of the characterful asymmetric appearance of the host dwelling as discussed above would have the cumulative effect of a monolithic block of development which would appear as cramped and overdeveloped within what is a generously sized plot. The expansion of the appeal property therefore to extend to the full width of the plot would have more of a dominating effect than the comparable examples in the area and exacerbate the effect of the domineering frontage.
11. In addition, other examples of large-scale development along this stretch of road have maintained the architectural integrity of the original building, and as a result the impact of the increased mass has had less impact on the street scene. The

proposed development would appear as an incongruous form of development within the wider street scene, and the character of the appeal dwelling would be severely eroded.

12. Overall, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its local area. It therefore would fail to comply with Policy PG3 of the Birmingham Development Plan (2017) which requires all new development to respond well to site conditions and local area context. It would also be in conflict with the Birmingham Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2022) and the design objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework (the NPPF).

Harm to the setting of listed buildings and the Edgbaston Conservation Area

13. The conservation area, and in particular Farquhar Road, derives its significance from the individuality displayed in the unique designs of the dwellings, reflecting how the area has developed over time. The appeal site contributes positively to the conservation area as a result of its position within the wider evolutionary character of the streetscape and the good examples of characteristic stockbroker Tudor features that it possesses. Whilst the proposed design would continue to provide individuality, the removal of the traditional features and the excessive scale of the flanking and rear extensions would result in the completed design appearing almost as a new property. This would dilute the historic character of the conservation area and thereby fail to preserve its significance.
14. Furthermore, the property in its current state complements and adds to the setting of the listed buildings, namely 15 and 17 Farquhar Road. These properties are both built in the Arts and Crafts style and therefore share some design elements with the appeal property such as the asymmetry of the principal elevations. The removal of the traditional features through the execution of the proposed design would therefore cause harm to the wider setting of the listed buildings.
15. The principle of extending a property along Farquhar Road is not new and a number of the other dwellings along the road have undergone a variety of alterations. However, I must assess the individual merits of the appeal before me. In this instance, the resultant development, through its scale and removal of asymmetrical character would be far removed from the existing dwelling. Consequently, it would represent an incongruous form and scale within its setting and that of the conservation area and the style would not respect the historic development of the Calthorpe Estate.
16. Paragraph 212 of the NPPF states that when considering the impact of development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 213 goes on to advise that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting and that this should have a clear and convincing justification. Given the above, I find the harm to the conservation area and setting of the listed buildings to be at the lower end of less than substantial in this instance but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight. Under such circumstances, paragraph 215 of the NPPF states that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The appellant has presented no case suggesting that the proposed scheme would result in any public benefit.

17. Therefore, the proposed development would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 215 of the NPPF and conflicts with Policy TP12 of the Birmingham Development Plan which requires new development to demonstrate a contribution to designated heritage asset through the protection or enhancement of its significance and setting. It would further fail to comply with the Birmingham Historic Environment Supplementary Planning Document and the NPPF as summarised above.

Other Matters

18. The appellant has indicated that the proposed development has already received consent from the Calthorpe Estate. However, this is not a matter I can consider under the appeal process.
19. I have considered the relevance of the appeal decision provided by the appellant, reference APP/P4605/D/13/2196519. I have determined that whilst there are similarities between the two proposals, the material difference relates to the perception of the development within the street scene and wider surroundings. The proposed development at the above appeal related to the side and rear of the property and in particular the replacement of an existing annex. My colleague also references the subservience of the proposed development in relation to the host dwelling which differentiate it from the current appeal proposal. Furthermore, I have noted that the appeal was decided against the relevant local plan policy at the time, which has now been superseded. This appeal scheme is not therefore directly comparable to the current appeal proposal, which I have in any event considered on its own planning merits.

Conclusion and Recommendation

20. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

E Clifford

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

21. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

F Wilkinson

INSPECTOR