

Appeal made against the refusal of planning permission

Appeal reference	APP/P1805/D/11/2155191
Planning Application	11/0198-SG
Proposal	Proposed alterations to existing roof to facilitate new first floor shower room
Location	Badgers Sett, 248B Old Birmingham Road, Marlbrook, Bromsgrove, B60 1NU
Ward	Marlbrook
Decision	Refused (Delegated decision) - 9th May 2011

The author of this report is Stacey Green who can be contacted on 01527 881342 (e-mail: s.green@bromsgrove.gov.uk) for more information.

Discussion

The proposal was for alterations to the existing roof to facilitate a first floor shower room.

The application was determined under delegated powers and refused on the basis that it would detrimentally erode the simple form and utilitarian character and appearance of the original building. The reason for refusal is noted below:

1. The siting, form and design of the proposed extension would detrimentally erode the simple form and utilitarian character and appearance of the original building contrary to policy DS2 and C27C of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan; the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 4 'The Conversion of Rural Buildings' and policy D.16 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan.

Firstly, the Inspector considers the effect of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. The Inspector agreed with the Council that the proposed extension would be small enough to ensure that it would not amount to inappropriate development for the purposes of PPG2: Green Belts and development plan policy. This is due to the extension being within the roof of the building which would not increase the footprint of the building. The Inspector considered that the projection of the extension at about 0.6m from the rear elevation would not have a significant harmful effect on the openness of the Green Belt or the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.

Secondly, the Inspector considered the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area. The Inspector notes that the dwelling is part of a former rural building within a farm complex and

is mainly brick with a pitched tiled roof that has dormer windows within it, and a gable about half way along its north elevation. He also notes that the building is significantly lower than a former barn that has been converted into a dwelling that is attached to its side. The Inspector acknowledges that the rural building has retained many of its original features but considers the building gives the appearance of being in residential use, particularly in relation to its fenestration.

The Council considered the addition of a gable fronted extension to the rear elevation would disrupt the section of unbroken roof slope that is an important aspect of the original form of the building. Taken together with the existing dormer windows, it was considered that the gable fronted extension would disrupt the plain and simple part of the building. Contrary to this the Inspector was satisfied that the proposal would be in keeping with the form and appearance of the original building. This was on the basis that the proposal would add a second gable to the roof on the north elevation. The gable would be a similar scale to the existing gable, albeit slightly wider, and would be sited within a plain stretch of the tiled roof between 2 of the dormer windows. It would be above a door and a small window, and would have a blocked window within it that would reflect the shape of the window within the existing gable. The gable would be small enough to ensure that it would not unacceptably disrupt that part of the roof, which is already broken up by the dormer windows and existing gable. It would not cause any imbalance, as there is a building attached to the one end and the dormer windows and ground floor windows are not evenly spaced throughout that elevation. The slight variation in the width of the gable from that of the existing would not be particularly noticeable.

Therefore, taking the above into account, the Inspector was satisfied that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the existing building. The proposal was found to comply with the advice given in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 4: Conversion of Rural Buildings, as it would not detract from the appearance of the former rural building.

It was therefore determined that the appeal should succeed.

Costs application

No application for costs was made.

Appeal outcome

The appeal was **ALLOWED** (1st August 2011).

Recommendation

The Committee is asked to RESOLVE that the item of information be noted.