



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 March 2023

by S Rawle BA (Hons) Dip TP Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/P1805/D/22/3306071

15 Cofton Lake Road, Cofton Hackett B45 8PL

- 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 Paul Dunbavin against the decision of Bromsgrove District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01730/FUL, dated 22 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as "a first floor extension. To build an ensuite to link to the existing master bedroom, building would be above an existing side store. Facing the house; location of extension would be to the right side".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a detached house located in an attractive residential area where houses are typically detached with a mix of styles. Properties generally have pitched tiled roofs and like a number of other houses in the area, the main roof of the appeal property has a hipped tiled roof. It also has a subservient two storey element with pitched roof that is set back slightly from the front elevation and set down from the main roof ridge. The attached single storey brick built store has a false part pitched roof which disguises the flat roof behind.
4. The side boundary of the appeal site is adjacent to the rear garden of the detached house on the corner of Reservoir Road. Because the land rises on the approach to the appeal site, the upper part of the side wall of the appeal property is clearly visible from the road.
5. The proposed first-floor extension would be constructed above the store with the side elevation projecting out at eaves height. It is designed with a flat roof with small false pitched roof to the front section. Due to the surrounding topography and the space provided by the rear garden of the adjacent house, the proposal would be prominent from the road. Although there is existing vegetation that provides some screening of the side elevation of the property, the vegetation will change with the seasons and cannot be relied on to screen the upper part of the dwelling.

6. In any case, I observed that the roof profile on this side of the appeal property was clearly visible when driving or walking up the hill. In this context the proposed flat roof extension and the false pitch roof would be highly prominent. The extension would appear incongruous with the generally pitched roofscape visible in the street scene and would not sit comfortably with the roof profile of the host property. As a result, the proposal would not complement the host dwelling or integrate into the street scene and would look harmfully out of place.
7. I acknowledge that some other properties in the area have had flat roof extensions, including a property two doors away. However, the appellant acknowledges that it is not his intention to follow these examples and they do not have the same relationship with their surroundings as the appeal property, so their impact is materially different. The appellant has also drawn my attention to a care home development in Cofton Hackett. However, this is a much larger scale development in a different setting and is materially different from the proposed development. In any event, the examples of other flat roofs provided do not justify harmful development at the appeal site.
8. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area in conflict with Policy BDP 19 of the Bromsgrove District Plan 2011-2030 adopted in January 2017 which amongst other things seeks to ensure that development achieves a high-quality design which enhances the character and distinctiveness of the local area. The proposal would also conflict with the Council's High Quality Design SPD adopted in June 2019 which advises that in order to contribute to the harmony of a building, the roof form should match that of the original development. Furthermore, the proposal would not accord with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure development is sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

9. I appreciate that no objections have been received from neighbours and I note independent advice has been sought, but there is little detail of this advice before me. These matters do not alter my conclusion on the main issue.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate that the proposal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

S Rawle

INSPECTOR