



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2022

by K Ford MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8TH November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D1835/D/22/3306939

7 Chase End Close, Worcester WR5 2BY

- 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 Paul Maglificio against the decision of Worcester City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00346/HP, dated 19 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 25 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of a 2 storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have used the description of development as it appears in the Council's decision notice as it succinctly describes the development proposed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a 2 storey semi detached house in a residential area. Gaps between properties provide a break in development to provide a more spacious character.
5. The 2 storey extension would extend to the edge of the plot at both ground floor and first floor level, adjacent to the boundary with No 5 Chase End Close. This would create a terracing effect that would harm the spacious character of the area. The use of materials to match the existing property would not overcome the harm.
6. Reference has been made to similar styled extensions in the same street and neighbouring streets and I observed a 2 storey side extension at No 13 on my site visit. However, the location and position of the property in relation to No 15 is different to the case before me and therefore not comparable. In any event, each case is determined on its own merits and my assessment is based on the information before me.
7. I note the reasons for the proposed extension and the consequences of a scheme compliant with the Council's planning guidance but this does not outweigh the harm I have identified.

8. The development would harm the character and appearance of the area and therefore conflict with the part of Policy SWDP21 of the South Worcestershire Development Plan which requires new development to be of high quality design, integrate effectively with the surroundings, complement the character of the area and be of a scale and massing that is appropriate to the setting of the site. It would also conflict with the South Worcestershire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document which normally requires that side extensions should be set back and be at least one metre off the shared boundary at first floor level.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons identified and taking into account all other matters, including the absence of objection from the neighbouring properties, the appeal is dismissed.

K Ford

INSPECTOR