
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2022 by A J Sutton BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

by H Nicholls FdA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/P1805/D/21/3284938

39 The Avenue, Rubery B45 9UE

- 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 Ms Claire Orpwood against the decision of Bromsgrove District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00574/FUL, dated 9 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is two storey side extension to residential property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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 property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for Recommendation

4. The residential area surrounding the appeal dwelling is generally characterised by relatively close-knit development and space is principally derived from the set-back position of dwellings and the wide streets. Within this setting, the appeal property has a prominent corner plot that is larger than the majority of plots occupied by neighbouring properties. Whilst there are examples of extensions at corner properties, the dwellings flanking this particular junction are relatively unchanged, and features on the side elevations of the appeal property and No 37, visible above the boundaries, adds interest and enables them to address both streets, which positively contributes to the area.
5. The proposal seeks to add a two storey extension to the side of the property, largely filling the width of the plot, albeit with a substantial set back from the front building line of the property. The extension would not disrupt the building line of development on The Avenue, and due to the gap at the rear of the property, it would not significantly harm the building line on Kineton Road. However, whilst the proposal would be subservient in height to the appeal property, its width would only be 0.50m less than the existing dwelling.

Moreover, given the unsympathetic design and its prominent corner location, this bulky addition would not appear a subordinate feature in the immediate area.

6. The substantial extension would also create a new entrance, the porch of which would, when observed from the side, cut across the retained bay window. The development would also remove a portion of the hipped detail above the bay. These changes would significantly disrupt an existing interesting feature which would harmfully alter the appearance of this part of the dwelling. The use of a matching palette of materials would not minimise this harm. The harmful effect would be localised, but the development would result in a substantially greater expanse of blank wall, significantly closer to the street and highly visible within the area. This would erode interest and positive features in the built form and this in turn would be detrimental to this part of the street scene.
7. I saw the extensions to properties on other corner plots in the area. The dwellings at 65 Callowbrook Lane and 1 Brook Road are very different in form and detail to the appeal property. The extension at 20 The Avenue has not expanded the width of the dwelling. These examples are therefore not comparable with this proposal for these reasons. I note the expanse of wall at 20 Richmond Road, but have not been provided with any details regarding this permission. Notwithstanding this, this example does not provide a justification for other harmful development in the area. Accordingly, I attach limited weight to this matter in this case.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. It would in this regard be in conflict with policy BDP19 of the Bromsgrove District Plan and guidance of the High Quality Design SPD which, collectively, seek high quality people focused space through, amongst other matters, ensuring development enhances the character and distinctiveness of the local area. It would also be inconsistent with design policies of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Conclusion and Recommendation

9. There are no material considerations that indicate the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A J Sutton

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

10. I have considered all the submitted evidence and agree with the recommendation. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Hollie Nicholls

INSPECTOR