

APPEAL REF: APP/P4605/W/23/3336011

Appellant: Midland Properties and Finance (Birmingham) Ltd

Demolition of existing buildings and construction of 83 residential apartments across two

poor quality anomaly in design terms. There are also complaints about the elevational treatment on Block A. Block B faces Harborne Park Road, a traditional residential street of predominately 2 or 2½ storey buildings. Block B is proposed at 4 storeys. Efforts to keep its height as low as possible have given rise to a compressed appearance. Overall, what is presented is not a high quality design that contributes to a strong sense of place. The new development will not integrate successfully with its immediate surroundings.

5. Second³, “the effect on the local highway network and its users, with particular regard to the parking requirements of the appeal proposal.” The Appellant contends that this scheme, in this location, is suitable for a ‘zero-parking’ approach. The ‘zero’, of course, relates to the parking provided on-site⁴. The Council accepts that access to local facilities and public transport is good. But even the Appellant does not contend that the development will be ‘zero-car’. Rather, the Appellant’s case is that the number of cars likely to be owned by occupants of the development can be accommodated, so far as parking is concerned, on local streets. This is where the disagreement lies. The Council’s case is that the Appellant has not demonstrated this, and that the evidence actually shows that there will be many more cars than available on-street local parking opportunities. The Appellant also observes that the highways officers had no objection subject to a 3 year post-development regime of parking surveys and a financial contribution to fund any necessary Traffic Regulation Order - presumably delivering a residents parking scheme. But the Council’s planning officers do not accept this will solve the problem. There will be no reduction in cars wanting to park. It will inevitably lead to pressure to re-purpose short-term restricted parking which will be objected to and adversely effect those benefiting from it at present.

6. Third⁵, “ whether or not satisfactory living conditions would be achieved for occupants of the appeal scheme, with particular regard to the quality of the proposed outdoor space.” Overall, the quantum of outdoor amenity space being provided is satisfactory in numerical terms. The only caveat on ‘the numbers issue’ is that once the private amenity space of some apartments is taken into account, the remaining space is not large enough to meet the Council’s standards for the remaining occupants. But the real issue is the quality of some of the space. Part of the ground-level designated amenity space is adjacent to the bin store and parking/vehicle access area. A roof terrace on top of Block

