



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 18 May 2021 by G Sibley MPLAN MRTPI

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Q1825/D/21/3270963

3 Southcrest Road, Redditch B98 7JG

- 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 Rashid Khan against the decision of Redditch Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/01047/FUL, dated 2 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 22 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is demolition of rear conservatory and erection of single storey rear extension and two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. No 3 is part of a typical post war residential development that follows a relatively formal layout with a moderate density of housing. Dwellings are typically semi-detached with consistent gaps around them, with larger gaps close to junctions. The host dwelling is typical of this layout, and the gap between it and No 1 along with its siting on higher ground give it a relatively spacious, open setting. Although some dwellings in the area have been extended in various ways, those extensions appear subordinate to the host dwelling in terms of their scale and appearance. As a result, the balance of the semi-detached pairs and the generally consistent character and appearance of the street scene has largely been retained.
5. The proposed two storey side extension would use similar materials, architectural detailing and roof form to the host dwelling. However, the proposal would be built flush with the front elevation of the dwelling and the roof would extend at the same ridge height, which would make it prominently visible in this elevated position. The proposed extension would be greater than half the width of the host dwelling and as such would be a bulky and disproportionate addition which would not reflect the proportions of the existing property.

6. Consequently, due to its size, height and bulk, combined with the lack of set back from the front elevation or set down from the ridge, the proposed extension would dominate the existing dwelling and would not appear subordinate to it. Therefore, it would not reflect the locally distinctive character of the existing dwelling or its relatively spacious setting. Consequently, the proposed side extension would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
7. The proposed single storey rear extension would extend out slightly from the flank wall of the dwelling, however this would not be particularly visible from the road. Therefore, and given its relatively small scale, it would appear subordinate to the host dwelling. Consequently, this element of the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the existing dwelling. However, as it would be connected to the proposed side extension, the two elements of the proposal would not be clearly severable and in this instance, it would not be possible to issue a split decision.
8. Accordingly, the proposed development would be contrary to Policies 39 and 40 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.4 (adopted 2017), the High Quality Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (adopted 2019) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which collectively require development be of a high quality and contribute positively to the local character of the area.

Other Matters

9. The appellant suggests the Council has approved extensions that do not accord with the advice contained with the SPD, and that there are other extensions in the area built flush with the front of the host property. However, no details of these schemes have been provided, therefore I do not know the circumstances that led to them being approved, or whether they were granted permission prior to the publication of the SPD.
10. While I saw some other two storey side extensions in the local area, they varied in design with a number built broadly in accordance with the SPD. Furthermore, where there were variances from the SPD, they were not so numerous that they have altered the overall character of the area, which is of pairs of similarly designed properties. Therefore, the grant of planning permission for other extensions locally does not justify these proposals.
11. I appreciate that the appellant wishes to maximise the useable space from the extension, and that they prefer the proposed design to the approach recommended by the SPD. However, this does not justify the harm the development would have on the character and appearance of the host property. Nor does the absence of objections make the development acceptable given the harm I have identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. There are no material considerations that indicate the application should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Sibley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

L McKay

INSPECTOR