

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2024

**by U P Han BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 17 June 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Q1825/D/24/3336889**

**8 Jays Close, Redditch, Worcestershire B98 0SF**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Weaving against the decision of Redditch Borough Council.
  - The application Ref is 23/01172/FUL.
  - The development proposed is single storey rear kitchen extension and first floor front bedroom extension above existing garage.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the first floor front bedroom extension above the existing garage. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey rear kitchen extension and planning permission is granted for the single storey rear kitchen extension at 8 Jays Close, Redditch, Worcestershire B98 0SF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/01172/FUL, and subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans 23-709-1, 23-709-2, 23-709-3 in so far as relevant to those parts of the development hereby permitted.
  - 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.

## Preliminary Matters

2. The proposed single storey rear kitchen extension is clearly severable from the proposed first floor front extension above the existing garage, as it is physically and functionally independent. Therefore, under section 79(1)(b) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), I have the power to issue a split decision in this case.
3. During my site visit I saw that construction of a single storey rear extension had commenced with the foundations having been laid. Nevertheless, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the development shown on the application drawings, referenced 23-709-1, 23-709-2 and 23-709-3.

## Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed first floor extension on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area.

## Reasons

5. The appeal property is a modern two-storey brick built detached house located in a cul-de-sac within a large suburban residential estate. Jays Close comprises of two storey houses which are fairly uniform in appearance due to consistent building types and a focussed materials palette.
6. The house has a garage to the front which projects significantly forward at a perpendicular angle. The proposed first floor extension would sit directly above the garage and feature a gable with a window. The extension would sit lower than the ridge of the house and no further forward of its front façade. Nevertheless, its position atop the existing garage projection and appearance would result in a prominent addition to the front of the property that would disrupt its simple composition. Moreover, despite the use of matching materials and a window of commensurate size, No 8 sits slightly forward of the houses to either side, so the extension would be conspicuous in the context of similar dwellings in the street scene. This would depart from the simplicity, balance, and uniformity found in the houses in Jays Close which contributes to its character and appearance.
7. The appellant has drawn my attention to similar development in Otter Close which is a cul-de-sac located immediately south of Jays Close. However, there are clear material differences between the proposal and these examples. These include the greater variety of house types in Otter Close and the shallower projection of the garages. Furthermore, I am not aware of the full circumstances of these properties and whether they have been extended or whether they are as originally designed. In any event, each scheme must be considered and determined on its individual merits.
8. The proposed first floor extension would not appear visually subservient to the existing dwelling and would be an unacceptably dominant feature in the street scene. I therefore conclude that it would have a significantly detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area. Hence, it would be contrary to Policies 39 and 40 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No 4 (Adopted January 2017) and the Borough of Redditch High Quality Design Supplementary Planning Document. These require development to respond to and integrate with the distinctive features of the surrounding environment, be of a high quality design that reflects or complements the local surroundings and materials and requires extensions to be subordinate and not to be the central feature of the building.

## Other Matters

9. The single storey extension proposed at the rear is modest in size and would add to a previous extension, in matching exterior wall finish, to provide a larger kitchen/family room. Due to its size and siting, the single storey extension would not affect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers or raise any issues in relation to the character and appearance of the area. The Council has not raised any concerns regarding this element of the proposal. Consequently, I consider it would comply with aforementioned requirements of Policies 39 and 40 of the Local Plan.

### **Conditions**

10. Having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance, I consider it is necessary, in the interests of clarity and visual amenity, to impose a materials condition, and conditions requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings and a standard time condition.

### **Conclusion**

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed in respect of the first floor front bedroom extension above the existing garage and allowed in respect of the single storey rear kitchen extension.

*U P Han*

INSPECTOR