



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/24/3353790

19 St Dunstons Crescent, Worcester, WR5 2AF.

- 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 Max Westwood against the decision of Worcester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/00560/HP.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two-storey extension to the side of the property above the existing single-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposed extension, first, on the character and appearance of the host dwelling at No19 and the street scene of St Dunstons Crescent as a whole and, second, on the amenity of the neighbouring property at No17, with particular regard to natural lighting.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. I consider that the proposed extension is inherently well designed, in character with the style and finish of the present house, with its lower-level hipped roof maintaining a reasonable degree of subservience to the main dwelling. Despite the appearance of a second front entrance porch to the proposed office, the front elevation would retain a generally harmonious appearance in its detailing and fenestration. Accordingly, I find no objection in terms of the character and appearance of the host dwelling itself.
4. Crucially, however, the proposed extension would stand very close to the side of No17, virtually closing the first-floor gap that presently exists between the two properties. This gap is typical of the otherwise varied street scene where, although the dwellings are close together, substantial distance has invariably been maintained between them at the upper level. Importantly, this has avoided any terracing effect that would be damaging to street character.
5. In the immediate vicinity of the appeal site, on the opposite side of No19, there is a clear gap to the side of No21. Between Nos 17 and 15, the gap is narrower but the space appears sufficient to distinguish the two buildings visually.

6. I consider that, in contrast, the proposed extension would appear to create terracing effect with No17. This would be unacceptably damaging to the street scene of St Dunstons Crescent as a whole.
7. As a result, the proposed development would be contrary Policy SWDP21 of the adopted Development Plan which, consistent with national policy, requires new development to be of high-quality design, integrating with its surroundings.

Amenity

8. The proposed two-storey side extension would extend relatively far back into the rear garden of No19 and appear significantly more prominent from the rear of No17. It would have the effect of reducing, to some degree, the amount of direct natural light reaching the neighbouring property from the north.
9. However, it does not appear to me that this effect would be so great as to cause a level of adverse impact on the living conditions at No 17 to alone to warrant substantive planning objection on grounds of residential amenity. I note incidentally that, in this connection, there is no objection from the neighbouring residents who express qualified support for the appeal.

Overall Conclusion

10. Overall, I conclude that, for the sole reason of adverse impact on the character and appearance of the street scene, this appeal should be dismissed.

B J Sims

INSPECTOR