
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 December 2016

by Andrew Owen BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 04 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P1805/D16/3160693

14a Cherry Hill Road, Barnt Green, Bromsgrove B45 8LJ

- 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 Dr Dave Dehal against the decision of Bromsgrove District Council.
 - The application Ref 15/0960, dated 6 November 2015, was refused by notice dated 21 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a room over the garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Barnt Green Conservation Area (BGCA).

Reasons

3. The BGCA varies in character from the large, loosely arranged dwellings in its west to the smaller more regularly positioned houses in the east, and accordingly the density of development in the BGCA increases from west to east. The appeal site is located within the central part of the BGCA which is characterised by large detached dwellings in spacious and verdant plots.
 4. The site is long and narrow and runs alongside a private access road which serves two houses to its rear, a property to its east as well as the dwelling at the site itself. The house is set towards the rear of the appeal site and is substantially screened from the access road by a tall and dense hedge on its rear and side boundary.
 5. The existing detached double garage is positioned towards the front of the site and is not screened from the access road. It is quite separate from the main house and is seen as a distinct building set in its own spacious and verdant context. Due to its size, including its tall, steeply pitched, gable roof, it currently appears prominently when seen from the access road. It is also clearly visible when passing the site along Cherry Hill Road.
 6. The proposal would involve turning the roof, increasing its height and adding two dormer windows facing the host dwelling so as to not overlook any neighbouring property. The appellant advises that the increase in the height of the roof would be 690 millimetres, whilst the Council state the increase would
-

be 1 metre. Whichever figure is correct, I consider an increase in height of this nature would make the garage appear more prominently when seen from Cherry Hill Road and from the access road. Furthermore, turning the orientation of the roof would increase the visual bulk of the building when seen from Cherry Hill Road as the view from this direction would change from that of a triangular gable end to that of a whole roof slope.

7. Due to its visually prominent position on its plot and its significant contribution to the Cherry Hill Road street scene, increasing the height of the garage and turning its roof would mean the resultant garage would dominate its immediate setting, appear incongruous in its context and would contrast with the spacious character of the BGCA.
8. Consequently the development would harm, and fail to preserve, the character and appearance of the BGCA. It would therefore be contrary to Saved Policies S35a and S36 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan which aim to ensure the design of development preserves or enhances the character and appearance of conservation areas.
9. It would also conflict with Policy BDP20 of the Bromsgrove District Plan Proposed Submission which also seeks to sustain the character and appearance of conservation areas. However as this Plan has yet to be adopted, I am unable to give full weight to its policies.
10. The harm to the significance of the BGCA would be less than substantial and therefore it is necessary, in accordance with paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework, to consider any public benefits from the proposal. In this case, I do not consider there would be any public benefits resulting from the scheme and therefore there is nothing that would outweigh the harm that the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the BGCA.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all other considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR