



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 December 2024

by **B J Sims BSc (Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D1835/D/24/3347782

27 Waterworks Road, Worcester, WR1 3EY

- 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 R Sims against the decision of Worcester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 23/00772/HP.
 - The development proposed is the erection of an upper extension to create semi-independent living space for occupation by persons with disability and alterations to existing bay window – replacement with two-storey bay.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Main Issue

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed upper extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling at 27 Waterworks Road and any particular material circumstances weighing in favour of the proposed development.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. No 27 Waterworks Road is within a brick-built terrace, typical of many in Worcester. There is some variation between the several terraces that make up the street scene of Waterworks Road and the surrounding area. However, the terrace which includes the appeal property possesses a visual continuity and harmony when viewed from the street. That is despite a few alterations and roof additions elsewhere in the terrace and a wide range of dormers and extensions along the rear, albeit the latter are not visible from the street.
4. I agree with the Council that the proposed full-width, upper extension, with its plane sloping roof, modern lines and extensive glazing, in contrast with the traditional, double bay windows proposed below, would dominate excessively the terraced host dwelling, causing it to appear top-heavy compared with its neighbours. This degree of alteration and built addition to the property would substantially exceed any other roof extension visible within the terrace or indeed the wider surrounding area, especially with respect to its excessive height.
5. There is nothing against innovative and even contrasting architectural design in principle. The Appellants quote a number of examples of approved roof extensions not dissimilar in style to that proposed here, including some nearby, such as at Nos 12 and 63 Waterworks Road. Properly judged on its own individual merits,

however, I consider that the degree of disruption and visual disharmony to the host dwelling and the terrace as a whole, that would result from the development, to be unacceptably harmful to their character and appearance and indeed to that of the street scene of Waterworks Road, as a whole. This would be contrary to established local and national policy seeking high quality design, in particular Policy SWDP21 of the adopted South Worcestershire Development Plan. I regard this effect as alone sufficient to warrant dismissing the appeal.

6. The development would also be partly visible between the trees bounding Gheluveld Park within the Riverside Conservation Area (CA), just across Waterworks Road from the appeal site. The Park is perhaps not the most valued part of the CA but there would be a degree of harm to its setting, adding to the case against the appeal.

Other Material Circumstances

7. I respect that this proposal is intended solely for the benefit of the disabled daughter of the Appellants, to enable her present home to provide the secure future accommodation she and her family will need as she grows into adulthood. It is clear from supporting medical evidence that this need is real and unenviable.
8. I recognise that, in principle, the development would be in line with the provisions of national policy favouring safe, inclusive, accessible and healthy accommodation for those with protected characteristics.
9. I recognise too that even built additions of this kind to the single appeal dwelling would benefit the building sector of the local economy, whilst supporting a disabled resident.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

10. However, any economic benefits would be relatively minor and I do not consider that, in planning terms, the interference with the character and harmony of the street scene that would result from the appeal proposal is proportionate to the material needs of the Appellant family, notwithstanding their evident immediate need for enhanced accommodation. Ultimately, I take the view that these transient personal circumstances, whilst material, are sufficient to outweigh the significant planning objection which I have identified.
11. I have taken account of every factor for and against this appeal and I am aware that there are no amenity or highway objections to the proposal.
12. However, I find nothing to divert me from my overall conclusion that, on balance, this appeal should be dismissed.

B J Sims

INSPECTOR