
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 January 2020 by A J Sutton BA Hons DipTP DMS MRTPI

by Sarah Housden BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P1805/D/19/3239551

211 Worcester Road, Stoke Heath, Bromsgrove, Worcestershire, B61 7JA

- 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 Gary Jackson against the decision of Bromsgrove District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/01029/FUL, dated 24 July 2019 refused by notice dated 3 October 2019.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension (bedroom above existing garage, convert existing bedroom to family bathroom).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor extension (bedroom above existing garage, convert existing bedroom to family bathroom) at 211 Worcester Road, Stoke Heath, Bromsgrove Worcestershire B61 7JA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 19/01029/FUL, dated 24 July 2019, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Location plan and proposed plans and elevations received 1 August 2019.
 3. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall accord with the details specified in section 10 of the planning application form submitted for the proposed development.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons for Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a detached dwelling occupying an elevated position and set back from Worcester Road. Development along Worcester Road is mixed in character, but to the south of the appeal property comprises similar suburban style dwellings, many of which have been extended. To the other side, No 209 Worcester Road (No 209) is a hipped roof bungalow with a dormer window in the front elevation.
5. Public views of the property are limited from the brow of the hill and it is partially screened by vegetation from some vantage points. However, it does occupy a prominent position in the row of properties, where its pleasing roof form makes a positive contribution to the residential character of the area. The appeal property has previously been extended to the side at first floor level, however, this extension is subservient in scale and well set back from the front elevation and has not disrupted the pyramidal form of the main roof.
6. The High Quality Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 2019 requires side extensions to be subordinate in size and prominence by being set down from the ridge of the dwelling and set back from the principal elevation. Proposals are to be considered on their merits to ensure that the proposed extension is appropriate to the property and its surroundings.
7. The proposal is for a first-floor side extension to be positioned over the existing garage. The extension would align with the principal elevation and be set back slightly, to retain the projection of the existing narrow gable and two storey bay window, porch and garage. The roof would extend flush from the existing hipped roof and the front wall would also be flush with the existing wall at first floor level. Whilst the pyramidal roof form of the existing dwelling would be lost, the ridge height of the extension would be approximately 1 metre lower than the apex of the existing roof and it would therefore be viewed as a subordinate element. The characteristic projecting gable would also be retained. As such, I consider that the proposed extension would not adversely affect the character and appearance of the host property to a material degree.
8. A number of dwellings in the row have been subject to alterations including at No 219 which has a first floor side extension flush with the original front wall. Having regard to adjoining development in the vicinity of the appeal property, the proposal would not appear unduly prominent or noticeable in the street scene and would not have an adverse effect on the character or appearance of the wider area.
9. There would be adequate separation distance between the side wall of the proposed extension and the dwelling at No 209 so that the extension would not appear unduly dominant or tall in relation to that property and would not adversely affect the street scene in that regard.
10. Whilst some details of the scheme would not entirely comply with the advice in the SPD, each case must be considered on its merits. In this case, based on the circumstances of the appeal site, I conclude that the proposed extension would be proportionate in scale to the existing property and would not appear unduly prominent in the street scene. It would therefore not conflict with Policy BDP19 of the Bromsgrove District Plan 2017 which seeks development of a high standard of design, ensuring it enhances the character and

distinctiveness of the local area and requires development to follow relevant guidance to achieve good design.

Conditions

11. In addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. To safeguard the character and appearance of the host dwelling, a condition requiring that the materials accord with the submitted details is also required.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons outlined above and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

A J Sutton

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on this basis the appeal is allowed.

Sarah Housden

INSPECTOR