



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 September 2025 by S Jamieson BA (Hons) MPlan

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P1805/D/25/3371694

179 Worcester Road, Hagley, Worcestershire DY9 0PR

- 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 Mark Taylor against the decision of Bromsgrove District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00599/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a 'two storey side extension over existing garage'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site (No 179) is located at the entrance to a short residential cul-de-sac, which branches off Worcester Road. There is much commonality on the street in terms of the detached plots, two storey height of properties, attached garages, hipped roofs and prevalence of white fenestration and brick facades. There is a mix of gable sided and gable fronted properties, some of which have been extended to the side. However, such extensions are mainly consistent in design and scale and maintain a subordinate relationship with the main dwelling.
5. Previous alterations to No 179 including its porch, loft conversion and facing materials give it a different aesthetic to neighbouring dwellings on the cul-de-sac. Nevertheless, it is a broadly similar size to these dwellings and the subservience of the garage and space this provides at first floor level between the dwelling at 181 Worcester Road, ensures that the dwelling sits comfortably within the street.
6. The Bromsgrove District Council High Quality Design SPD (SPD) (2019) requires side extensions to be subordinate in size and prominence. To achieve this, the SPD specifies that extensions should be clearly set down from the ridge of the dwelling and set back from the principal elevation.

7. Due to its roofline level with the host dwelling's ridge, the front gable feature and the alignment of the first floor front elevation flush with the principal elevation of the dwelling, the extension would lack the subservience specified in the SPD. As a result, the proposal would have an unduly bulky appearance and would make the extended dwelling appear visually dominant alongside the neighbouring dwelling at 81 Worcester Road. This effect would be exacerbated by the appeal site's prominent position at the entrance to the cul-de-sac.
8. I accept that the development would utilise materials which would complement the host dwelling. However, this would not be sufficient to assimilate the discordant scale of the extension or the resultant dwelling amongst other dwellings on the street.
9. Whilst I acknowledge that the applicant sought to engage with the planning process and made certain design amendments in response to officer feedback, the scheme before me is unacceptable for the reasons set out above. There is nothing to suggest that functional internal space could not be achieved through a more sympathetic design.
10. The proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. In that regard, it would conflict with Policy BDP19 of the Bromsgrove District Plan (2017), which requires good design and that development enhances the character and distinctiveness of the local area. For the same reasons, it would also be inconsistent with the section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires good design which adds to the quality of the area and is sympathetic to local character.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Jamieson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR