



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 October 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/D1835/D/25/3368821

11 Elm Green Close, Worcester, Worcestershire WR5 3HD

- 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 Theresa Madden against the decision of Worcester City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00263/HP.
 - The development proposed is Single storey front and first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to single storey front extension. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to first floor rear extension and planning permission is granted for first floor rear extension at 11 Elm Green Close, Worcester, Worcestershire WR5 3HD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00263/HP, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted: 25-787-2, 25-787-3.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site relates to a detached house with a ground floor garage and recessed front door with a single pitched roof above them. The first floor above the garage sits back behind the main building line. The house is one of a row of similarly designed houses, although there are some minor variations such as Nos 7 and 15 having no ground floor garage, and No 13 having a flat roof over the garage and the front door flush with the front wall, rather than recessed. None have front extensions, although I note that several houses on the opposite side of the road have been extended.

4. The proposal includes adding a first floor to the existing ground floor rear extension. Its roof would match the pitch of the main house roof but sit below it and as such be subservient. Windows would match those on the ground floor and there would be no greater potential for overlooking into neighbours' gardens than currently exists. It would meet the design requirements of the South Worcestershire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2018) (SPD). The council acknowledge that this aspect of the proposal is acceptable, and I agree.
5. Most front gardens along the Close are open to the tarmac footway without any front boundary walls, although some have hedges along their side boundaries and low shrubs at the front along the footway edge. Consequently, the common front building line shared by Nos 7 to 15 is obvious, despite the gaps between houses.
6. The proposed ground floor extension would project approximately 2m beyond the existing front elevation and have a single pitched roof. It would breach the common building line I have described and thus appear out of character with neighbouring houses and prominent on the host property. It would also result in a single pitched roof across the entire first floor frontage, which would be out of keeping with houses in the same row, which have roofs across half their frontage, generally over garages and front doors such as on the host property. The proposed front extension would therefore conflict with Policy SWDP 21 of the South Worcestershire Development Plan (2016), the SPD and the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) which support high quality design that has a positive impact on the street.

Other Matters

7. I have had regard to the examples of extensions elsewhere on Elms Green Close provided by the appellant. I note that they mostly predate the SPD and current development plan and have resulted in significant variations to the front of houses on the opposite side of the road. However, as I have noted above, houses within the same row as the appeal property remain largely unaltered at the front and in this context the appeal proposal would be particularly obtrusive. Therefore, the examples given are not directly comparable to the appeal proposal. 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.
8. Given that the proposed first floor rear extension described above is acceptable and is physically and functionally severable from the proposed single storey front extension, I consider a split decision would be appropriate to allow planning permission for this element of the proposal.

Conclusion and Conditions

9. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should succeed in relation to the first floor rear extension. However, in relation to the single storey front extension the appeal should be dismissed.
10. I have attached the standard time limit condition and a plans condition as this provides certainty. I have also added a condition concerning materials to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR