



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 July 2019

by S Shapland BSc (Hons) MSc MILT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/J1860/D/19/3229289

137 Christine Avenue, Rushwick, Worcester WR2 5ST

- 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 Spencer Lowe against the decision of Malvern Hills District Council.
 - The application Ref 18/01709/HP, dated 12 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 08 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached two storey property with single storey side element, situated within a residential cul-de-sac. The surrounding properties within the cul-de-sac are of a similar two storey design, and benefit from sizeable separation distances between the dwellings.
4. South Worcestershire's Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document: Overarching Design Principles 2018 (SPD), states that side extensions should be set back at least 1 metre from shared boundaries. This is to protect the visual gap between properties and to ensure there is not a terracing effect. The proposal would remove an existing single storey side element and replace this with a two-storey extension.
5. The two-storey extension would breach this 1 metre separation distance and removes the visual gap between the two properties. This leads to a terraced effect and a cramped form of development. I find that the proposal would therefore harm the character and appearance of the area by creating a terracing effect. This reduces the visual gap between the two properties which is out of keeping with the existing street scene.
6. The appellant has stated that other properties within the cul-de-sac including No 139 benefit from similar two storey extensions. It was evident from my site visit that this was the case. Whilst No 139 benefits from a two storey extension

which is within 1 metre of the shared boundary of the appeal property, there remains a reasonable feeling of openness between the two properties. This is because of the single storey element of the appeal property maintains a visual gap between the two. The other properties in the cul-de-sac which have two storey side extensions benefit from considerable separation distances between the houses. Furthermore, these extensions appear to exceed the 1 metre separation distance required by the SPD and there is no terracing effect between them. Therefore little weight can be given to this in my consideration of this appeal.

7. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such it conflicts with policy SWDP21 of the South Worcestershire Development Plan, SPD and section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Collectively these seek to ensure, amongst other things, that all new development delivers high quality design which complements the character of an area.
8. For the reasons above the appeal is dismissed

S Shapland

Inspector