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21 Augusta Road East, Moseley, Birmingham, B13 8AJ

Change of use of existing property to 3 self-contained flats, with erection of dormer windows to front and rear, demolition of existing garage to side, and erection of two storey side extension

Applicant: Mr S Mohammed
21 Augusta Road East, Moseley, Birmingham, B13 8AJ
Agent: Alps Architectural Services
Unit 3, 201-203 Alum Rock Road, Birmingham, B8 3EU

Recommendation
Approve Subject To Conditions

1. Proposal

1.1. The proposal is for the change of use of No. 21 from a single family dwellinghouse into three self-contained flats, with the demolition of the existing single storey garage to the side and its replacement with a new two storey side extension. New dormer windows are also proposed to be incorporated on the roof of the existing property.

1.2. The property as extended would provide a three-bed flat on each of the three floors. All flats would be accessed via the existing front door of the property and existing hallway/landing, which would become communal. Flat A, at ground floor, would accommodate three double bedrooms, a lounge, a kitchen and a bathroom. Flat B, at first floor, would accommodate two double bedrooms, a single bedroom, a lounge/kitchen area and a bathroom. Flat C, at second floor, would accommodate a double bedroom (with en-suite), two single bedrooms, a shower room and a lounge/kitchen area.

1.3. The proposed side extension would measure 4.6m in width, a maximum of 10m in depth, 10m in height to roof ridge, and 7m in height to eaves. Its footprint would be splayed to the rear in order to retain side access to the rear garden from the frontage. The proposed extension would be set back from the front elevation of the existing building by 0.34m (although the submitted plan suggests this would be 0.45m). It would be constructed of facing brickwork and the roof would be tiled. A rooflight would be incorporated on the front roof slope of the extension, and a second rooflight would be incorporated on the rear roof slope of the extension. A bay window would be incorporated on the front elevation of the proposed extension at ground floor, with a first floor window above. A second floor level window would be incorporated on the side elevation of the proposed extension and would be obscurely glazed. Windows would be incorporated at ground and first floor level on the rear elevation of the proposed extension.
1.4. Pitched roof dormer windows are proposed to be incorporated on the front and rear roof slopes of the existing building, one on each roof slope respectively. Each dormer window would measure 1.5m in width and 2.2m in height to its roof ridge. The front dormer window would project out from the roof by a maximum of 3.1m and the rear dormer window would project out from the roof by a maximum of 3.4m. Each dormer window would be constructed of vertical tile hanging cheeks and roofs would be tiled.

1.5. The front driveway would remain unchanged with room to accommodate four parked cars.
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2. Site & Surroundings

2.1. No. 21 is a two storey, Victorian, semi-detached, single family dwellinghouse, with additional accommodation in the roofspace, and a lean-to garage to the side. The dwellinghouse has a tarmaced driveway to the front. It has a short rear garden with a fenced-in pedestrian alleyway immediately adjoining the site to the west, and providing access to the rears of Nos. 14-18 Park Road. Located opposite the site, on the other side of Augusta Road East, is a nursing home. Augusta Road East is a cul-de-sac having been closed off to traffic from Park Road, with pedestrian access remaining between the two roads.

2.2. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character, with many properties having been converted into flats, including the immediately adjoining property at No. 19 Augusta Road East which accommodates three flats. The site is located within the Moseley/Sparkhill Area of Restraint.
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3. Planning History

3.1. 10.07.80 - 36892001 – Conversion to three self contained flats – Approved

3.2. 10.06.14 - 2014/02880/PA - Change of use of existing property to 2no self-contained flats, with erection of dormer windows to front and rear, and erection of two storey extension to side to create new three bedroom dwelling house – Withdrawn

4. Consultation/PP Responses

4.1. Transportation Development – No objection – Subject to condition requiring details of cycle storage

4.2. Regulatory Services – No objection

4.3. West Midlands Police – No response received

4.4. Severn Trent Water – No objection – Subject to drainage condition
4.5. Local residents, Ward Councillors, Residents Associations and M.P. notified – No responses received

5. **Policy Context**

5.1. The following local policies are applicable:
- Birmingham UDP
- Draft Birmingham Development Plan
- Places for Living SPG
- Moseley/Sparkhill Area of Restraint SPG
- Moseley SPD
- Car Parking Guidelines SPD

5.2. The following national policies are applicable:
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

6. **Planning Considerations**

6.1. Policy 5.19B of the Unitary Development Plan states that some residential areas contain properties which have been converted into institutional uses, day nurseries, nursing homes, flats or houses in multiple occupation and that concentrations of such uses can have an adverse effect upon the essential residential character of a particular street or area. Areas of Restraint have been identified where further changes of use of large dwelling houses to non-family dwelling house uses will be resisted.

6.2. Policy 8.27 of the Birmingham UDP concerns flat conversions, stating that proposals should not have an unduly adverse effect on the amenities of adjoining occupiers; properties should be of a sufficient size to permit the creation of individual dwelling units of a satisfactory size and layout; the cumulative effect of non single-family dwellinghouses uses on the residential character of the area should be taken into account; the effect of the proposal on parking provision should be taken into account; and that any external works forming part of a proposal should be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the application property and surrounding area. It also states that if a site lies within an Area of Restraint planning permission may be refused on the grounds that further development of such non-family dwellinghouse uses would adversely affect the character of the area.

6.3. Policy 17.32 identifies the Moseley/Sparkhill Area of Restraint. This is an area consisting of large Victorian and Edwardian houses many of which have been converted into flats and bedsits, and institutional uses such as care homes and hostel accommodation. Within this area further change of use from C3 dwelling houses are to be resisted as they may adversely affect the character of the area, and the policy notes a continuing demand for the retention of large properties for family use and the importance of ensuring that a balanced housing stock is retained to enable those demands to be met.

6.4. Notwithstanding that the application site is located within the Moseley/Sparkhill Area of Restraint I consider that the principle of change of use to three flats may be acceptable, subject to design, layout and cumulative impact considerations, as per Policy 8.27 of the Birmingham UDP. This is because the Area of Restraint policy is from 1992 and is therefore out of date and based on old survey data. I also note the following:
6.5. Policy 8.27 requires consideration as to whether the proposed development would result in a cumulative harmful impact on the character of the area. All properties immediately adjoining the site are in use as flats - with three flats at No. 19 Augusta Road East, four flats at No. 18 Park Road, four flats at No. 16 Park Road, and four flats at No. 14 Park Road. Of the eleven properties (including the application property) located on the southern side of Augusta Road East, I estimate that at least five of these properties have been converted into flats. On the eastern side of Park Road, from Nos. 2-18, I estimate that at least seven of the ten properties have been converted into flats. With such a high number of flat conversions already having taken place in the vicinity of the application site, it is considered that a threshold has already been crossed by which changing the use of a further property into flats would make no material difference to the overall character of the area, which is apparently already changed from that which the policy sought to protect. As such, I do not consider any further, material, cumulative harm would occur and in this instance there would not be any justifiable reason to refuse the application in principle on this point, particularly bearing in mind the date of Area of Restraint policy. In addition, the property would still retain the appearance of a single dwellinghouse, and could easily be converted back to a single family dwellinghouse in the future.

6.6. Policy 8.27 states that it is preferable to use detached properties for the proposed use. Semi-detached properties such as the application property may be considered suitable but the potential effect on adjoining occupiers needs to be considered. The immediately adjoining property, No. 19 Augusta Road East, which shares a party wall with the application property, accommodates three flats and so the amenity of these occupiers is less likely to be adversely affected by the proposal than if this were occupied as a single family dwellinghouse. As such, I am not persuaded consent should be withheld on this matter, nor that internal noise insulation should be required by condition. I note Regulatory Services have raised no objection to the proposal.

6.7. Policy 8.27 of the UDP states that properties should be of sufficient size to permit the creation of individual dwelling units of a satisfactory size and layout. I consider the size of each flat would be generous with Flat A providing approximately 100sqm of floorspace, Flat B providing approximately 91sqm of floorspace, and Flat C providing approximately 85sqm of internal floorspace. Bedroom sizes within the proposed flats would range from 12sqm to 19.5sqm and all would meet the recommended minimum size guidelines set out in the Council’s Places for Living SPG. Whilst there would be some restricted head height for the occupiers of the two single bedrooms to be accommodated in the roofspace of the proposed extension, a furniture layout demonstrates that these rooms would not be unduly cramped.

6.8. Places for Living SPG recommends 30sqm of outdoor amenity space to be provided per flat, generating a requirement for 90sqm. Although only 50sqm of useable garden space would be provided to the rear I do not consider the application could successfully be refused on the grounds of lack of private amenity space. I note that the very significant amenity of Cannon Hill Park is close by.

6.9. Policy 8.27 of the Birmingham UDP requires that any external works forming part of a proposal should be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the application property and surrounding area. I consider the principle of a two storey side extension to the property to be acceptable. Amended plans have been submitted following concerns raised about the design and appearance of the proposed extension and the fact that it did not appear subservient to the main
property. Amended plans received include amendments made in respect of setting the front elevation of the extension in from the main property by 0.34m to make it appear subservient, revising window design to make them more in keeping with the Victorian appearance of the building, and omitting oversailing of first and second floor to the side/rear. The proposed dormer windows would be of a size and positioning on the roof of the existing building such that they would appear in keeping with the existing building. I note that there are already two dormer windows situated on the front roof slope of the adjoining property No. 19 Augusta Road East. I am satisfied that the design and appearance of the proposed extension and dormer windows would be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the existing building and locality.

6.10. Given there is only one window incorporated at second floor on the side elevation of the proposed extension serving a corridor, and this is to be obscurely glazed (which could be conditioned accordingly), I am satisfied that there would be no overlooking opportunities or loss of privacy to the occupiers of No. 18 Park Road whose rear garden is located adjacent to the site to the south west.

6.11. The Council’s Car Parking Guidelines SPD recommends a maximum of two car parking spaces per flat for the proposed use. There is existing frontage driveway parking available for four cars, which would provide 133% parking provision, and which would comply with the Council’s SPD. On-street parking at this location is unrestricted and typically demand is fairly high. However, Transportation Development have raised no objection to the proposal and advise that whilst there may be a minor increase in traffic and parking demand generated by the proposal, it is not considered that this would be significantly greater than that of a large family dwelling. Transportation Development have recommended that a condition be attached to any consent requiring details of secure and sheltered cycle parking provision (requiring at least one cycle space per flat in accordance with the Car Parking Guidelines SPD).

6.12. Although Severn Trent Water have requested a drainage condition be attached to any consent, it is not normal practice to attach such a condition where this relates to an extension to an existing property.

7. **Conclusion**

7.1. I consider that the proposed development would provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers, with no cumulative harm on the character of the area, nor material harm to immediately adjoining occupiers. The design and appearance of the proposed extension would be acceptable. As such I consider the proposal would constitute sustainable development and I recommend that planning permission is granted.

8. **Recommendation**

8.1. Approve Subject to Conditions

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Requires the scheme to be in accordance with the listed approved plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Requires the prior submission of sample materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Requires the prior submission of cycle storage details

4 Requires the prior submission details obscure glazing for specific areas of the approved building

5 Limits the approval to 3 years (Full)

Case Officer: Andrew Conroy
Figure 1 – Front elevation