



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 November 2017

by S J Lee BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 17th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/P1805/D/17/3180909

1 Cobham Close, Bromsgrove B60 3LA

- 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 Mrs Alison Ramlal-Price against the decision of Bromsgrove District Council.
 - The application Ref 17/0242, dated 27 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 28 June 2017.
 - The development proposed was originally described as the *"addition of an assisted living, kitchen/living area and first floor bedroom. This is being built to accommodate the applicants elderly mother who has moved in with the family"*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey side extension and flat roof dormer to the rear at 1 Cobham Close, Bromsgrove B60 3LA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 17/0242, dated 27 March 2017 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: Drawing No 100 Issue A; Drawing No 200 Issue A; Drawing No 201 Issue A; Drawing No 202 Issue A; Drawing No 203 Issue B; Drawing No 204 Issue B; Drawing No 205 Issue B; Drawing No 205 Issue B – Proposed Attic Layout; Drawing No 205 Issue B – Proposed Elevations.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mrs Alison Ramlal-Price against Bromsgrove District Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matter

3. The description in the header comes from the original application form. I have, however, used the description of development from the Council's decision notice in my formal decision as this provides a clearer and more accurate

description of the proposal which also removes superfluous wording not related to development.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal relates to a semi-detached dwelling located on a corner plot in a residential estate largely made up of dwellings of a similar style. As a result of the set back of dwellings from the roadside and the width of pavements and verges, the area has a generally open feel. A high hedgerow provides the boundary treatment to the front garden which continues around the corner from Lyttleton Avenue. A tall close-boarded fence screens the rear garden. The space to the side of the house appears to be used for off-street parking.
6. The host property already has a single storey pitched roof rear extension projecting into the garden that sits flush with the gable end that faces the street. The proposed side extension would abut this and extend out toward the pavement. It would project no further out from the rear of the dwelling than the existing extension, but would extend back across part of the gable end.
7. There would clearly be some reduction in space to the side of the building as a result of the extension. However, the sense of openness around the corner is already constrained to a degree by the high hedgerow, fencing and parking. There is no suggestion that the boundary treatments are to be removed and thus the broad character of the corner plot would be largely maintained, particularly when viewed from Lyttleton Avenue. While the extension would clearly still be a visible feature, the boundary treatments would also provide some degree of screening from parts of Cobham Close itself and from Lyttleton Avenue.
8. The design of the extension would complement that of the host dwelling and would not appear out of place in the wider context of the estate. It would also not be so tall or prominent so as to have a significant effect on the open character of Cobham Close or that of the wider estate. In this case, I do not consider that being visible in the street scene necessarily equates to the development being an incongruous or harmful addition to it.
9. The proposal also includes a full width dormer window on the rear roof slope and rooflights on the front. The Council has not referred to these in either its decision notice or the officer report submitted with the appeal. It would be reasonable to assume therefore that they have no concerns about the impact of these features. There is nothing before me to suggest that I should come to a different conclusion.
10. Taking all above factors into account, I find that the development would not have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, there would be no conflict with the design objectives of Policy BDP19 of the Bromsgrove District Plan (2017). There would also be no conflict with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework in terms of securing high quality design.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has drawn my attention to comments from the highway authority on the loss of parking spaces from the site. The Council has not provided me with any formal objection to the proposal and this factor did not form part of the reason for refusal. While the development would be likely to result in the loss of some parking space, I saw nothing to suggest that this is likely to cause significant pressure for on-street parking in the area, or that it would inevitably lead to highway or pedestrian safety issues.

Conditions

12. I have considered the suggested conditions from the Council in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). In addition to the standard condition which limits the lifespan of the planning permission, I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition requiring the materials used to match those of the existing building.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

S J Lee

INSPECTOR