



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 November 2024

by U P Han BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/R1845/D/24/3349870

7 Meadow View, Stourport on Severn, Worcestershire DY13 0JS

- 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 Miss Rachael Swift against the decision of Wyre Forest District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/0228/HOU.
 - The development proposed is single storey front extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a two-storey semi-detached house which forms part of a staggered building line of semi-detached pairs. The property is typical of 1970s style housing featuring white cladding on the front and a gabled roof. The existing dwelling has a small front extension with flat roof which accommodates a toilet and forms part of the lobby. The site also contains a fully paved drive to the front of the building. The appeal site is in a housing estate characterised by a mix of predominantly detached and semi-detached housing of fairly uniform design.
4. The proposal seeks to erect a single storey front extension of around 3.5 metres in depth and 1.4 metres in width. The proposed extension would accommodate a downstairs bedroom and be finished externally in brick with a dual pitched roof and front facing gable.
5. Policy DM25 of the Wyre Forest Local Plan 2016-2036 (adopted April 2022) (the LP) requires residential extensions to comply with the listed policy criteria including that they be in keeping with the architectural characteristics of the original building, harmonise with the existing townscape and not create incongruous features.
6. The siting, design and scale of the proposed extension with its dual pitched roof and position projecting well beyond the front elevation of the host dwelling would create an incongruous and visually dominant feature, at odds with the simple coherent design of the existing building.

7. The proposed extension would disrupt the rhythm of the building line and create an anomalous feature in the street scene by reason of its design, scale and siting. While the proposal would not be visible from the entrance of the cul-de-sac of Meadow View, it would be visible from near the end of the cul-de-sac, and thereby contribute negatively to the street scene.
8. The appellant has pointed to the variety of alterations to other properties in the cul-de-sac. However, none of these include a front extension so are not directly comparable to the proposed scheme. The appellant has also drawn my attention to the property on the opposing corner of the cul-de-sac with a separate bungalow built to the front and side of the property. However, the bungalow at 17A Meadow Drive is a separate property to 17 Meadow Drive and physically separated from it. The bungalow is not an extension of 17 Meadow Drive and therefore not comparable with the appeal proposal.
9. I note the extension would fulfil a family's need for additional space, however, little weight can be attached to such personal circumstances.
10. Compliance with the LP with regard to the 45 degree rule and parking provision will weigh neither for or against the proposal and is considered neutral.
11. For these reasons given, I conclude that the proposed development would unduly harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. Consequently, it would conflict with the Policies DM24 and DM25 of the LP insofar as they require development to achieve high quality design and complement the character of the area, as well as requiring residential extensions to be in keeping with the architectural characteristics of the original building.

Conclusion

12. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

U P Han

INSPECTOR