

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 August 2024

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R1845/D/24/3344325

218 Sutton Park Road, Kidderminster, DY11 6LD

- 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 and Mrs Bater against the decision of Wyre Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/0119/HOU.
 - The development proposed is a first floor extension over existing garage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The appellants draw attention to a recent decision to approve a similar proposal earlier in 2024¹.
3. However, whilst, like the appeal before me, this also related to a proposal for a first floor extension over the existing garage, I note the Council's comment that this previous proposal was approved subject to the receipt of amended plans to ensure that the extension would be positioned back from the principal elevation of the property, in line with local policy and guidance.
4. I note that the proposal relating to this appeal does not set the proposed extension back from the property's principal elevation.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling with a single storey garage attached to the western elevation. The dwelling is set back from the road behind a low wall with railings above, an evergreen hedge and a large parking area.
7. The appeal property is located in a residential area characterised by the presence of mostly two-storey detached and semi-detached dwellings along

¹ Reference: 23/0852/HOU.

Sutton Park Road, set back behind gardens and/or parking areas, with gardens to the rear.

8. During my site visit, I noted that the presence of occasional street trees combines with that of gardens, hedgerows and the setting back of dwellings to provide for a green and spacious character. I also observed that whilst many dwellings have been extended and/or altered, such changes tend to appear in keeping with the host dwelling and the character of the area.
9. In the above regard, whilst dwellings in the immediate area vary in design and appearance, none appeared to me to have been altered in a manner that overwhelms the host dwelling and/or detracts significantly from the area's attributes.
10. The proposed development would result in a first-floor extension that would not be set back from, but which would appear flush with, the appeal dwelling's front elevation. I find that this, in combination with the scale, height and prominent siting of the proposal to the front of the dwelling, would result in a development that would draw attention to itself and in so doing, would overwhelm the appearance of the host dwelling.
11. Whilst I recognise that the presence of an evergreen hedge and deciduous trees reduces the overall impact of this, particularly during the summer months, the proposal would still be visible within the street scene and furthermore, it would appear particularly prominently during the winter months and/or as a result of any reduction in height or removal of the hedge.
12. Taking all of this into account, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework; to Wyre Forest District Local Plan (2022) Policy DM.25; and to the Council's Wyre Forest Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document (2015), which together amongst other things, seek to protect local character.

Other Matters

13. In support of their case, the appellants refer to various other developments in the wider vicinity. However, none of these comprise developments and circumstances so similar to the proposal before me as to provide for direct comparison and in any case, I have found that the proposal would result in significant harm and this is not something that is mitigated by the presence of other developments elsewhere.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, the appeal does not succeed.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR