



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2025

by **P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J1860/D/24/3357199

41 Winsmore, Powick, Worcester, WR2 4QY

- 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 Ian McGarrity against the decision of Malvern Hills District Council.
 - The application Ref is M/24/00589/HP.
 - The development proposed is the removal of the existing side extension and garage and replacement of new two storey side and rear extension to property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the house and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Winsmore comprises mainly semi-detached 2 storey houses set around a large central area of grass open space. Houses are set back behind front gardens and driveways. Pairs of dwellings closest to the junction with Upton Road have significant gaps between them and neighbouring houses, particularly at first floor level. This allows views of open sky and trees to their rear which contributes to the spacious and verdant character of the street scene
4. According to the plans submitted with the planning application, the appeal property has a flat roofed side utility room and lean-to connected to a side garage. At the time of my visit wooden hoardings were placed in front of them, above which the utility room and lean-to were visible but not the garage. Nonetheless, it appears that the property extends at ground floor level up to the boundary with No 40. No 40 has a 2 storey extension connected to a single storey garage which abuts the boundary with the appeal site. Thus, at ground floor level the neighbouring houses are very close. However, they retain a large gap at first floor level, consistent with the gaps between other neighbouring pairs of houses that I have described as being an important component of the street scene.
5. The proposed development would replace the single storey garage and utility room with a 2 storey side extension which would be below the main roof ridge, stepped down and stepped back at first floor level to break up its mass. According to the appellant, there would be a 1.8m wide side access between the appeal site and the boundary with No 40, and a 1.9m gap between the two properties at first floor level.

This would reduce the terracing effect that the council describe. Nonetheless, it would substantially fill the important visual break between the houses and obstruct views of the sky and vegetation to their rear. It would also significantly widen the front of the appeal property and interrupt the symmetry that currently exists with the adjoining house leading to unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the wider street scene.

6. The proposed development would, therefore, conflict with Policy SWDP 21 of the South Worcestershire Development Plan (2016) and the principles of the South Worcestershire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2018) which require development to be of a high quality design which integrates with its surroundings and reinforces local distinctiveness.

Other Matter

7. I note that other houses in Winsmore have side extensions, including No 40. However, they are smaller scale than the appeal proposal; either single storey or 2 storey with a single storey element stepped down; and preserved a gap between the first floors of neighbouring houses. They are not therefore directly comparable with the proposed development. In any case, I have come to my own view regarding the development rather than relying on the approach the Council may have taken elsewhere.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR