



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 October 2022

by David Jones BSc (Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/D1835/D/22/3305410

Sandhurst, 73 Martley Road, Worcester, Worcestershire WR2 6HH

- 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 B Emerson against the decision of Worcester City Council.
 - The application Ref 22/00266/HP, dated 29 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 14 July 2022.
 - The development proposed is to make the existing annex, which houses the 4th bedroom, a 2 storey annex, therefore moving the 4th bedroom upstairs and making the rear extension slightly larger.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to make the existing annex, which houses the 4th bedroom, a 2 storey annex, therefore moving the 4th bedroom upstairs and making the rear extension slightly larger, at Sandhurst, 73 Martley Road, Worcester, Worcestershire WR2 6HH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 22/00266/HP, dated 29 March 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan, Proposed Floor Plans and Elevations.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. As the initial set of plans submitted to the Council did not include a scale, revised plans were requested and subsequently submitted by the appellant on 14 July 2022. However, in addition to including a scale the revised plans also included minor alterations to the proposed extension. The Council has confirmed that these amended plans formed the basis for the Council's decision. To remove any doubt, I have determined the appeal based on the plans referenced as having formed the basis of the Council's decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, and on the living

conditions of occupiers of neighbouring residential properties at 1 and 3 Brook Cottages with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal property is a detached two-storey dwelling located within a predominantly residential area. The property is set above road level and is of a largely rendered finish with single storey additions to the side and rear. The surrounding area comprises a variety of different house types, sizes, and styles, including detached, semi-detached, and terraced dwellings.
5. The proposed development would see the erection of a first-floor extension above the existing single storey element to the side. The eaves level of the proposed extension would be at the same height as those of the existing property, however its ridge height would be set down lower than the roof ridge of the host dwelling providing a clear 'design break' between the existing and proposed built form. Consequently, whilst the first-floor extension would increase the overall size and mass of the dwelling it would not appear overly dominant and would represent a subservient addition to the host dwelling.
6. Additionally, the materials and proportions of the proposed extension would closely match those of the existing dwelling, resulting in the proposal being in-keeping and consistent with the character and appearance of the host property.
7. Despite being set above road level, the host property is not overly prominent within the wider street scene. Due to both the curvature of the road and established planting the proposed first-floor extension would not be readily visible in longer distance views along Martley Road. Though partial views would be possible from other public vantage points, including from Heronwood Close to the rear, the proposed development would not appear unduly prominent or as a dominant feature within the street scene.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling or surrounding area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with Policy SWDP21 of the South Worcestershire Development Plan (adopted February 2016) (SWDP) which seeks, among other matters, to ensure that development proposals integrate effectively with its surroundings and complement the character of the area.

Living Conditions

9. 1 and 3 Brook Cottages are located to the west of the appeal site, with their rear gardens sharing a boundary with the site. I acknowledge that the ground levels of Nos 1 and 3 are set significantly lower than the appeal site, however I find that by virtue of the separation distance between the proposal and these neighbouring properties, the proposed development would not have an overbearing impact and would therefore not cause undue harm to the occupiers of Nos 1 and 3 outlook.
10. Furthermore, although the proposal would result in additional mass at first floor level, due to the amount of planting and landscaping which exists between the appeal site and Nos 1 and 3 the proposed development would be partially screened from view, further reducing its impact on outlook from these properties.

11. Notwithstanding the screening provided by the existing planting and landscaping as described above, the west facing elevation of the proposed extension would be blank and therefore there would be no concerns with regards to potential overlooking from the proposed development in any event.
12. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of occupiers of Nos 1 and 3 Brook Cottages, with particular regard to outlook. The development would therefore accord with Policy SWDP21 of the SWDP which seeks, among other matters, to ensure that developments provide an adequate level of outlook and are not unduly overbearing.

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area and the host property, it is necessary to impose a planning condition requiring the use of matching materials.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Jones

INSPECTOR