



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 October 2024

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/P1805/D/24/3350642

1 Poplar Drive, Barnt Green, Worcestershire, B45 8NQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Miss Lydia Williams against the decision of Bromsgrove District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00514/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the construction of two-storey and first-storey front extensions, and a pitched roof over, and single-storey extension to the rear of, the existing side flat-roofed garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are the effects of the extensions on the character and appearance of the area around Poplar Drive, and on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 3 Poplar Drive by way of light and outlook.

Reasons

3. No 1 is a detached house situated on the eastern side of Poplar Drive, to the rear of No 11 Hewell Road, which is a corner plot. It has a long forward projecting garage which, at the time of my site visit, was in the process of alteration/demolition, apparently as part of construction work relating to an earlier planning permission granted on appeal (ref: APP/P1805/D/3330282). The earlier permission was for the erection of ground-floor front and rear extensions with a first-floor extension over the existing garage. The current proposal includes a similar first-floor extension above the garage with the addition of a first-floor above the previously approved ground-floor front extension to the side of the garage.
4. Policy BDP1 of the Bromsgrove District Plan (DP) indicates that in considering proposals for development, regard will be had to the impact on residential amenity and the impact on visual amenity. Policy BDP19 of the DP indicates that the Council will ensure that development enhances the character and distinctiveness of the local area.
5. The houses on Poplar Drive are of a very similar basic design. I note that Nos 1, 3 and 5, along with Nos 2, 4 and 6 opposite, have long forward projections containing garages and front rooms/porches. Nos 3 and 5 have pitched roofs above these front projections, while the appeal property and the houses

opposite have flat-roofed projections. The houses further south along the road have shallower front projections with a mix of garages, canopies and porches. As a result of the earlier permission at No 1, it will be the only house on the road with first-floor accommodation above the existing front projection.

6. The inspector at the earlier appeal noted that the ridge of the first-floor extension would be lower than that of the main roof and it would match the main construction in its external finishing materials. As a result, he considered that the front extension would appear subordinate and complementary to its host, and also that it would not depart unacceptably from the established building line. By way of contrast, the current proposal includes an additional first-floor extension with a pitched roof on the southern side of the front elevation, and a higher pitched roof to the side extension element. These would significantly increase the size and scale of the front extensions as well as their visual prominence in the street scene. The proposed front extensions would dominate the existing house both visually and in terms of bulk.
7. From my site visit, it would appear that the extension currently under construction as a result of the earlier permission may project further forward than the existing garage. If so, whilst it would not break the building line formed by the side elevation of No 11 Hewell Road, it would extend the building line in the context of the front extensions at Nos 3 and 5. In any event, and regardless of any impact on the building line, the current proposed development would result in an uncharacteristic and over-dominant feature when compared with the smaller front extensions of other houses along Poplar Road, and it would be harmful to the appearance of the road.
8. The appeal property lies to the north of the adjacent No 3. From the information before me, it appears that the proposed extension to the front of No 1 would not break a 45 degree line from the first-floor front windows in No 3. On this basis, I do not consider that the proposal would be harmful to light received by the window in No 3. However, the two-storey front extension at the appeal property would be very close to the boundary with No 3 and would have a large blank brick wall with a gable end projecting forward from the main building line of both houses. In addition, as a result of the local topography, No 3 lies at a slightly lower level than No 1. I find, therefore, that the proposed front extension would present something of an oppressive outlook to the occupiers of No 3, by reason of its depth, height, position and design.

Conclusion

9. In conclusion, I find that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area around Poplar Road and that it would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 3 Poplar Road by way of outlook, albeit by a small amount. On this basis, it would conflict with Policies BDP1 and BDP19 of the DP. Accordingly, I dismiss this appeal

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR