

## Report for Information

### Appeal made against the refusal of planning permission

**Appeal reference** APP/P1805/D/12/2170319  
**Planning application** 11/0790

**Proposal** A first floor, one storey extension to bedroom with apex roof on existing porch.

**Location** 19 The Spinney, Wythall, Birmingham B47 6HB  
**Ward** Wythall  
**Decision** Allowed

The author of this report is Stacey Green who can be contacted on extension 1770(e-mail: S.green@bromsgrove.gov.uk) for more information.

### Discussion

The proposal is for a is a first floor, one storey extension to bedroom with apex roof on existing porch.

The application was determined under delegated powers and refused due to the following reason as detailed below;

1.

By virtue of its siting and scale, the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, which is contrary to Policy CTC.1 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan 2001, Policies DS13 and S10 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan 2004 and the provisions of Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 1: Residential Design Guide.

The Inspector found the main issues to be:

The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal site and its surroundings.

### Discussion

The appeal site comprises a two storey detached house located on a corner of The Spinney within a modern estate of similar two storey detached and semidetached houses. The proposed first floor addition would be sited above the existing flat roofed front porch and would have a pitched roof which would form an extension to the existing roof plane. Core Policy 3 of the Council's Draft Core Strategy 2 includes, amongst the development principles for all new

proposals, the need to consider the impact of the development on visual amenity, whilst Policy CTC.1 of the Worcestershire County Structure Plan requires that proposals for development should be informed by and be sympathetic to the character of the area. Policy S10 of the Bromsgrove District Local Plan and advice in the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance 1: *Residential Design Guidance* provide more detailed guidelines for extensions.

Although the proposed extension would be sited to the front of the appeal site in a prominent corner position it would only be of a modest size and would not increase the footprint, width or height of the existing house nor materially reduce the size of the gaps between the existing and adjoining buildings. The scale of the proposed extension would be such that the proposal would be clearly subservient to the present dwelling. The proposal would respect the proportions and style of the property and the roof would follow the design and angle of pitch of the existing structure. Matching materials would be necessary but these can be controlled by an appropriate condition. The proposal would be in scale with and well related to the original building.

The absence of any similar extensions in The Spinney is not necessarily a significant ground for objection in itself and although the additions at 234 and 240 Station Road are different in scale and design I saw that the first floor elements they contained were generally not out of keeping with the character of the area. The Council has the necessary powers to resist any unacceptable proposals in the future.

## **Conclusion**

The Inspector concludes that the proposed development would not have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the appeal site and its surroundings in accord with relevant development plan policies.

## **Appeal outcome**

The appeal was **Allowed** subject to the following conditions;

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
2. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the submitted site plan (1:1250), elevations drawing (1:50) and floor plan drawing (1:50) dated as received by the Council on the 3 October 2011.

## **Costs application**

No application for costs was made