



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 June 2022

by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 June 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D1835/D/21/3289804

31 Georgina Avenue, Worcester WR2 4LP

- 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 and Mrs Neil Bourhill against the decision of Worcester City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00654/HP, dated 9 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of a ground and first floor side and rear wrap-around extension with pitched roofs to match existing.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have used the description of development from the Council's decision notice. It adequately and simply describes it instead of the much longer and detailed description given on the application form.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposed development upon the living conditions of the occupiers of 33 Georgina Avenue; and
 - The effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living conditions of existing occupants

4. The proposed development would result in the upper floor of the dwelling extending closer to the boundary with No.33. However, it would be set a reasonable distance off the boundary maintaining separation between the two properties. Whilst it would project beyond the rear wall and would be visible from the rear of No.33, due to this separation it would not result in a sense of enclosure or diminish the outlook experienced to a degree that it would be overbearing for its occupants.
5. Whilst the proposal would project outwards from the rear elevation it would not breach the 45-degree code set out in the South Worcestershire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2018) in relation to the nearest habitable

room window at No.33. As such, I am satisfied that it would not result in an unacceptable loss of daylight or sunlight.

6. Assessing the scheme against the existing and proposed circumstances it would not unacceptably harm the living conditions of the occupants of No 33. Consequently, the proposal would accord with Policy SWDP 21 of the South Worcestershire Development Plan (2016) (SWDP) which, amongst other things, requires developments to provide an adequate level of outlook, sunlight and daylight, and should not be unduly overbearing.

Character and appearance

7. The host property comprises a detached dwelling located within a residential area. The property has a simple brick and render appearance with a bay column feature to the front. The property has been altered in the form of a side garage and a side and rear wrap around extension. Although properties have been altered the general design of dwellings within the surrounding area are similar whilst plots sizes and shapes vary.
8. I acknowledge that the proposed development would remove the lean to and garage extensions resulting in greater separation from neighbouring dwellings. However, the combination of extensions to the appeal property would result in a development that would be significantly large and disproportionate when considering the size of the host property dominating its appearance. As a result, it would be visually discordant with nearby properties.
9. The proposed dormer window would lack architectural subtlety being unsympathetic to the appearance of the host building. Its overall form would unacceptably dominate the roof and would result in visual confusion on account of its design. The dormer window would be an unduly large and bulky feature being unacceptably prominent. It would be clearly visible and an incongruous feature within the area.
10. The appellant indicates the proposal would provide a 'home for life'. Whilst this is a personal benefit of the scheme, it is insufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified in relation to this issue.
11. The appellant has suggested the proposed development would have better thermal performance and reduced carbon footprint. However, in this particular regard, it would not outweigh the harm that I have identified.
12. I note the presence of other extended properties in the area. However, I have not been made aware of the individual circumstances that led to them being considered acceptable by the Council. In any case, every appeal must be considered on its own merits, as I have done. The presence of other extensions in the area does not justify the harm that I have identified.
13. I conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area contrary to SWDP Policy 21 which, amongst other things, expects developments to be of a high-quality design that integrates effectively with its surroundings and complements the character of the area.

Other Matters

14. I note that representations were made to the application by local occupants raising additional concerns. However, given my findings, it is not necessary to consider these matters in detail.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above the appeal does not succeed.

B Thandi

INSPECTOR