



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 February 2025

by **D Cleary MTCP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1825/D/24/3356212

Hall View, Salt Way, Astwood Bank, Redditch B96 6JT

- 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 Mr & Mrs Wilkes against the decision of Redditch Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00763/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as a dining and kitchen extension to original front of house
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a dining and kitchen extension to original front of house at Hall View, Salt Way, Astwood Bank, Redditch B96 6JT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/00763/FUL, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plan referenced:

P-01/2 retro - Pre & Post Development Plans & Elevations
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be as detailed in the application.

Preliminary Matters

2. On my site visit I observed that an extension in the location of the appeal scheme had taken place and appeared to be substantially complete. Planning permission is therefore sought retrospectively. Notwithstanding this, the appeal scheme seeks to amend the materials and fenestration configuration to the development which has been carried out. Consequently, I have assessed the appeal development based on the plans provided rather than the development which is in situ.
3. The Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 12 December 2024. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been amended. As a result, I have not sought submissions on the revised Framework, and I am satisfied that no party's interests have been prejudiced by taking this approach.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the building.

Reasons

5. The appeal dwelling is a two-storey, detached property which is located within a relatively isolated open countryside location. The dwelling is of red brick and clay tile construction. The dwelling appears to have been subject to a number of extensions to the side and rear, while also being subject to various other alterations and reconfiguration. The dwelling is visually discrete with significant roadside vegetation screening the dwelling from the public highway. A single storey extension, which is the subject of this appeal, has been erected to the front of the dwelling. This has predominantly rendered elevations and a three pane French doors which is positioned to one side of the elevation. This appeal relates to a redesign of that extension.
6. The scheme proposes a ground floor extension to the front elevation of the dwelling, this is the elevation which addresses the main entrance to the property and is the most visible façade. The extension would occupy much of what is understood to be the width of the original dwelling, albeit it would be off set slightly from either side. The degree of projection from the elevation is not significant. This modest projection, together with its single storey height would ensure that the extension would appear visually subordinate to the remainder of the property. The pitch of the roof would be shallower than the existing dual pitched roofs. As noted above, the extension would appear visually subservient meaning that it does not visually compete with the existing dwelling. Importantly, the ridge line would be perpendicular to the ridge lines of the main roof. This would mean that the gables would not be read side by side and, therefore, the difference in pitch would not appear as markedly contrasting.
7. The use of render on the extension which has been erected results in a stark contrast with the more subdued red brickwork. This contrast in materials results in a prominent addition to the most visible façade of the building. The appeal scheme proposes the use of brickwork to match the existing. Matching materials would ensure that the extension would appropriately assimilate with the appearance of the original building. Furthermore, the constructed scheme has an imbalance of openings which adds visual incongruity to the elevation, particularly when set against the simple arrangement of openings in the original elevation. The appeal scheme proposes two windows positioned equally either side of a central door. The windows would create greater vertical alignment with the upper windows and more harmoniously respect the original arrangement of openings. These amendments would result in a more sympathetic extension to the host dwelling compared to that which has been undertaken.
8. The development would result in the loss of ground floor openings, to what is understood to be the original front elevation. Nonetheless, the dwelling has been subject to significant extension and alteration. These alterations have significantly diluted the legibility of the original dwelling. I have not been provided with any evidence to persuade me that these features are of such interest to the property which would require their retention. Importantly, as identified above, the appeal

scheme would replicate a sense of balance to the elevation with an appropriate vertical alignment and general arrangement of openings. Furthermore, the dwelling is well screened from the public highway and is not visually prominent. As such, it is not considered that the loss of original ground floor features would be harmful to the character and appearance of this significantly altered building.

9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing building. Therefore, the development complies with Policies 39 and 40 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 (2017). These, amongst other things, seeks to deliver development which is of a high-quality design which contributes positively to the local character of the area.
10. I have also had regard to the advice contained within the Borough of Redditch High Quality Design Supplementary Planning Document (2019) and find the development complies with the general principles of the guidance with particular regard to form, scale, massing, and materials.

Conditions

11. While an extension is complete it is not the development for which permission is sought. Therefore, I have imposed standard conditions relating to the commencement of development, and to require compliance with the submitted plans for certainty. I also attach a condition for materials to be as detailed within the application, which specifies the use of matching brickwork, which is in the interest of the character and appearance of the building.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR