



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 September 2022

by Bhupinder Thandi BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/H1840/W/22/3298313

Land at 2 Spa Road, Droitwich

- 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 N Major against the decision of Wychavon District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/02854/FUL, dated 30 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 4 April 2022.
 - The development proposed erection of 1 no. detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises the side garden of 2 Spa Road located on a prominent corner. The property sits comfortably within its plot with a good margin of land around it contributing to the sense of spaciousness that exists at this junction and reflecting the character of corner properties locally. The surrounding area is characterised by dwellings and flatted developments set back from the highway behind open frontages which contribute to this spacious environment.
4. Whilst the proposed development would be subservient to No 2 with active frontages and constructed from sympathetic materials, by virtue of its position further forward of dwellings on Blackfriars Avenue it would be at odds with the pattern of development locally. The development would erode the sense of openness that currently exists on this corner and would be over-dominant in the street scene adversely affecting the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposal would not successfully integrate into the street scene by virtue of its narrow width and small plot, appearing as an unduly cramped and incongruous feature eroding the sense of spaciousness that currently exists, irrespective of the presence of the existing boundary fence.
6. I conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to Policy SWDP 21 of the South Worcestershire Development Plan (2016) and guidance contained within the South Worcestershire Design Guide which, amongst other things, require development to complement the character of the area; for its scale, height and massing to be appropriate to the surrounding townscape and

to respond sensitively to the scale, form and massing of existing development. It would be contrary to paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework which states that developments that are not well designed should be refused.

Other Matters

7. I acknowledge that the proposed development would not adversely affect the living conditions of nearby occupiers and would provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers including in respect of garden space. I also note that the Highways Authority raised no objection to the application. However, these factors would not overcome the harm that I have identified.
8. Whilst Council Members have taken a different view from that of their officers, they are not duty bound to follow the advice of their officers provided that there are sufficient planning grounds to come to a contrary view. As seen from my decision I agree that there were sufficient grounds for refusing planning permission relating to the impact on the character and appearance of the area.
9. I note that representations were made by local occupants raising additional concerns. However, given my findings, it is not necessary to consider these matters in detail.

Conclusion

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

B Thandi

INSPECTOR