



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 June 2020

by Andrew Smith BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/P1805/D/20/3248261

1 Crothorne Drive, Hollywood B47 5PZ

- 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 Niel Mabbett against the decision of Bromsgrove District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00089/FUL, dated 23 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension to form additional bedroom and kitchen extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within a residential area where properties are positioned on typically consistent front building lines set back from the front of their plots. The area thus has a spacious and somewhat formal character and appearance. It is also the case that the area is well vegetated, with a noticeable array of planting contributing to the public realm. The appeal site contains a corner plot property that is setback from both Crothorne Drive (the Drive) and Hollywood Lane.
4. Whilst the proposed extension has been designed with a roof ridge that would be set down in comparison to the property's full ridge height, it would not occupy a setback position relative to the property's principal elevation and the front and rear facing roof slopes of the extension would be of different pitch when compared to the main roof. The proposal would thus not appear in full harmony with the host building and this would be particularly noticeable due to the site's prominent corner plot location.
5. The High Quality Design Supplementary Planning Document (June 2019) (the SPD) sets out, amongst other provisions, that side extensions to dwellings on corner plots must respect the building line of both street frontages and provide interest on both elevations. The current appeal property's position is respectful of the setback location of nearby properties that address the northern side of the Drive. In contrast, the proposed extension, which would have an

inconsistent roof form and a blank elevation setback only a short distance from the Drive, would appear as a stark, unsympathetic and unduly prominent addition to the streetscene.

6. I acknowledge that there is currently some planting in place to the outer southern edge of the site (adjacent to the Drive), and that it would be possible for this planting to be retained or replaced/reinforced as part of the scheme in the interests of softening the proposed extension's appearance. Even so, considering the narrow nature of the space in question, it would not be possible to establish a thick screen of planting to the southern side of the extension. Indeed, even when noting the substantial screen of vegetation that exists to the southern side of the Drive (opposite to the site), the proposed development would be readily visible from various publicly accessible vantage points.
7. Several other local developments have been referred to within the evidence before me. However, none of these other sites have an immediate visual relationship with the appeal site. They are thus of limited relevance. In any event, unlike the appeal property, each of the properties at 24 Dark Lane and 31 and 33 Truemans Heath Lane are not neighboured to the rear by a row of properties that occupy broadly consistent setback positions. Furthermore, an example provided at Lint Meadow comprises new build development rather than an extension such that it is difficult to draw direct comparisons with the appeal proposal.
8. For the above reasons, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. The proposal conflicts with Policy BDP19 of the Bromsgrove District Plan (January 2017) and with the SPD in so far as this policy and guidance seeks that development enhances the character and distinctiveness of the local area, that extensions reflect the proportions of the original building and that side extensions to dwellings on corner plots respect the building line of both street frontages and provide visual interest on both elevations.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has indicated a potential willingness to make amendments to their proposal. However, for the avoidance of doubt, the appeal process cannot be used to evolve a scheme and I must consider the proposal based on the plans that are before me. Whilst the appellant has voiced dissatisfaction as regards the Council's handling of the planning application that is now the subject of this appeal, such comments are of little relevance to the planning merits of the scheme.
10. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when read as a whole and material considerations do not lead me to a decision otherwise.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Smith

INSPECTOR