



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2020

by Paul Cooper MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P1805/W/19/3236502

Land between 4 & 6 Walton Road, Bromsgrove, Worcestershire B61 0EA

- 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 Mr Christopher Cullingford against the decision of Bromsgrove District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00179/FUL, dated 11 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 April 2019
 - The development proposed is proposed 1 bedroomed bungalow to suit elderly or disabled residents.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within a residential area, siting adjacent to No 6 Walton Road, and backs on to the rear of Nos 2, 4 and 4a Walton Road, and No 197 Birmingham Road. From my site visit, it includes a garage on part of the site, but appears to be mainly used for the parking of vehicles, as Walton Road is unadopted, and the properties are set close to the highway, therefore parking is at a premium in the immediate locality.
4. The proposals show that a modest one bedroomed property would be constructed, with a parking space to the front, accessed from Walton Road. The existing site would be amended to allow for parking space provided to the front for the use of Nos 4 and 4a. Private amenity space would be provided adjacent to the new dwelling toward the rear of the site.
5. Properties on Birmingham Road generally follow a standard building line, whilst Walton Road is high volume development, with properties close to the highway giving a dense layout, with private gardens to the rear.
6. Whilst the development would be modest in terms of size, it would be visible from Walton Road, and I find that given the size of the site, and location of surrounding properties, it would appear contrived in design to fit the very cramped site, and would sit behind the immediate building line set by Nos 6, 8 and 10 Walton Road which have traditional gardens to the rear. It would

appear incongruous within the locality and would not relate well to any of the properties that surround the site.

7. Therefore, I find that the proposal would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area, and would be in conflict with Policies BDP1, BDP19 and BDP7.2 of the Bromsgrove District Plan (2017) (the BDP) which amongst other matters, states that development should have regard to the impact on visual amenity and utilise high quality design and should respond to local character.

Other Matters

8. It is clear from the evidence before me that the Council is not able to demonstrate a five-year housing supply. In these circumstances it is appropriate for me to assess the proposal having regard to Paragraph 11 of the Framework. In this case I am satisfied that the policies on which the Council relied are consistent with the aims of the Framework. Consequently, any conflict with them carries full weight in my assessment.
9. I accept that the proposal would provide a modest social benefit arising from the added supply and mix of housing in a location which has access to public transport and other services. The proposal would also make use of an underused plot of land and there would be some limited economic benefits associated with the creation of employment during the construction period.
10. However, I have identified that there would be significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. As a result, even if the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year housing land supply, the adverse impacts associated with the proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole. The presumption in favour of sustainable development therefore does not apply in this case.

Conclusion

11. I have concluded that the proposal would conflict with the development plan. There are no other material considerations that outweigh this conflict and for this reason I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Paul Cooper

INSPECTOR