
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 April 2017

by Gareth W Thomas BSc(Hons) MSc(Dist) PGDip MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21st April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P1805/W/16/3163679
68 New Road, Bromsgrove B60 2LA

- 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 R Solanki against the decision of Bromsgrove District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/0894, dated 8 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension to provide a separate data storage and privacy room at 68 New Road, Bromsgrove B60 2LA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/0894, dated 8 September 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 3318-02A; 3318-03, and; OS Location Plan Scale 1:1250.
 - 3) The extension hereby permitted shall be used for the purposes of data file storage or other storage use ancillary to the main use of the property as a dental surgery and privacy room only. At no time shall the extension be used for the treatment of patients whatsoever.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Dr R Solanki against Bromsgrove District Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural matter

3. The description of the proposed development in the application differs to that shown in the Council's decision notice. As the Council's description accurately reflects the nature of the proposal, I have considered the appeal on the basis of a single storey extension to provide separate data storage and privacy room.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effects of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and wider area.
-

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a comparatively substantial building containing both single storey and two storey elements located on the corner of New Road and Wellington Road. As a corner plot, the property occupies spacious grounds and has an off-set relationship with its neighbours giving it a somewhat standalone presence in the street scene. Due to the number of alterations over time however, the property has a complicated footprint and roof form. That said, the hip roofed arrangement is a defining characteristic of the overall design composition.
6. A recent appeal¹ for a single storey extension on the side of the principal elevation fronting New Road and therefore on the opposite end of the property was dismissed on the grounds that it would introduce an incongruously designed addition that would be shoehorned at an angle to the side of the property, which would also result in an overdevelopment of the site. Although the details of that appeal are not before me, the specifics of that scheme as described in the Inspector's decision are different from what are now before me.
7. The proposal would see the erection of a single storey extension measuring some 3.6m x 3.25m and taking up part of what is an existing recessed area to the side fronting Wellington Road. It would continue the line of the wall and hipped roof of an existing extension. The proposed hipped roof to the front of the extension facing onto New Road would match the shape profile of the front facing hip over the entrance but at a lesser scale. The scale of the hipped roof when viewed from New Road would represent a subservient element by comparison. Whilst the previous Inspector opined that the proposal before him represented a complex and cluttered appearance when taken together with the previous extensions at this site, the proposal before me is for an entirely more restrained arrangement, particularly when viewed from New Road. The matching roof form and materials in particular help to soften the overall effects.
8. I conclude that the proposed extension would not harm the character and appearance of this property, which in turn means that the character and appearance of the street scene similarly remains unharmed. Consequently, the proposed development would comply with Policies DS13 and E4 of the Bromsgrove Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework that seeks, amongst other things, to ensure that new developments respond to local character and reflect the identities of local surroundings. Given the status of the Emerging District Plan, I am unable to attach significant weight to draft Policies BDP1 or BD19 at this juncture.

Other matters

9. Several representations from local residents include references to ongoing problems associated with the lack of parking facilities at this site. However, I am mindful that the use of the proposed extension is to provide confidential data storage facilities and as a private reception room and would not be used in a way that would be likely to result in an increase in the numbers of patients attending this surgery. The use of the extension for these purposes is

¹ APP/P1805/W/15/3139789 dated 20 June 2016

therefore unlikely to generate additional parking requirements. I also note that the local highway authority did not raise objections to the proposal.

Conditions

10. The Council has suggested that three conditions be imposed; I have considered these against the advice contained in the Government's Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the statutory period for commencement, a condition is attached that specifies the approved drawings to provide certainty. I have included the Council's suggestion that a condition be imposed that limits the use of the extension. I have amended the Council's suggested wording to provide certainty.

Conclusion

11. Having regard to the above reasons and all other matters raised in this appeal, I conclude that this appeal should succeed.

Gareth W Thomas

INSPECTOR