



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2026

by **Alexander O'Doherty LLB (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/D1835/D/25/3374309

49B Teme Road, Worcester WR4 9AW

- 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 Z Iqbal against the decision of Worcester City Council.
- The application Ref is 25/00329/FUL.
- The development proposed is described on the application form as, "proposed 1 bedroom annex ancillary to host property rear garden amenity area 25/00329/FUL planning application".

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Differing to the description of development in the banner heading above, the Council's decision notice accurately describes the development as shown on the supporting plans as, "Proposed rear annex". I have used this description in my consideration of the appeal since it best describes the proposed development in precise and concise terms.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposed development would constitute a separate dwelling from 49B Teme Road, and if so, its effect on the character and appearance of the area;
 - the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, with particular regard to privacy and visual impact; and
 - the effect of the proposed development on highway safety.

Reasons

Whether a separate dwelling & character and appearance

4. The appeal site comprises 49B Teme Road (No 49B), a semi-detached dwelling located in a residential area. In common with most other dwellings in the vicinity, No 49B benefits from a modestly-sized private amenity area to its rear, and a driveway to its front.
5. The proposed single-storey flat-roofed 1-bedroom annex would replace the existing shed at the rear of the plot at No 49B. It would be much larger than that shed. Its footprint would be sizeable in comparison with No 49B. Internally, the annex would contain a lounge / kitchen area, and a bedroom with an en-suite shower room. The proposed lounge / kitchen area would be of a broadly similar

size as the rooms which serve a similar function at No 49B. Overall, the proposed annex would provide a generous amount of living space.

6. With the inclusion of a kitchen, a lounge area, and a bedroom with access to a toilet and a shower, with ample space for washing facilities to be installed if required, it could easily contain all of the facilities required to support day-to-day living. Moreover, the proposed annex could be accessed independently of No 49B, via the pathway to the side of No 49B. It would have its own dedicated amenity area to the front of the proposed annex. A car parking space would be provided for users of the proposed annex, which would be accessed by a set of steps leading to a newly-created parking area to the rear of 47B Teme Road (No 47B). Accordingly, the proposed annex would not follow the guidance given at paragraph 8.3.26 of the SPD¹ which provides that, amongst other things, ancillary accommodation should only provide limited accommodation and it should share facilities with the main property and be physically linked.
7. Few details have been provided to explain who would occupy the proposed annex. As such, it has not been demonstrated that the future occupiers of the proposed annex would live as part of the household at No 49B. Details of care arrangements, if any, for the intended occupiers of the proposed annex have not been specified. The limited information provided does not demonstrate that the proposed annex would not result in the creation of a new household on site.
8. All-in-all, due to the lack of an adequate physical and functional connection between the proposed annex and No 49B, the proposed annex would be tantamount to a separate dwelling on site. This would be contrary to the guidance given in paragraph 8.3.26 of the SPD which provides that, amongst other things, an extension or alteration to a dwelling to provide further accommodation for use by a dependent relative is usually acceptable provided that it is designed to demonstrate dependency on the host property.
9. Taking account of its height (approximately 2.8 metres), due to its large size, its footprint (which would cover a considerable proportion of No 49B's rear private amenity area), and that it would extend very close to proposed side boundary fencing of the plot at No 49B, it would appear over-sized in comparison with both No 49B and the amenity area in which it would be sited. When seen from the rear garden of 49 Teme Road (No 49) it would appear as an overly-dominant and incongruous feature in its position to the rear of the site, where such large structures of a utilitarian design are not commonplace in the locality.
10. I therefore find that it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would not constitute a separate dwelling from No 49B, and I find that the proposed development would have an unacceptable and harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with part A. of Policy SWDP 21 of the South Worcestershire Development Plan (adopted 2016) (SWDP) which provides that, amongst other things, all development will be expected to integrate effectively with its surroundings, in terms of form and function.

Living conditions

11. The proposed annex would contain windows facing towards the rear of No 49B. The proposed fencing to the sides of No 49B's plot would obscure much of the

¹ South Worcestershire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document: Overarching Design Principles (adopted 2018)

views from these windows towards the rear garden of No 49 and towards the parking area to the rear of No 47B. Thus, the proposed development would not have a harmful impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with particular regard to privacy.

12. No 49B is situated at a higher level than No 49. The proposed annex would be a significantly larger structure than the existing shed on site, and would be sited in an elevated position relative to the ground level to the rear of No 49. Due to its height, it would noticeably rise above the proposed fence along the common boundary between No 49 and No 49B. Due to its size and scale and close proximity to the boundary with No 49, it would appear as a prominent and obtrusive structure when seen from the rear garden at No 49. This would undermine the enjoyment of the use of the garden for the occupiers of No 49. Harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 49 would result.
13. I therefore find that the proposed development would have an unacceptable and harmful effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 49, with particular regard to visual impact. It would conflict with part B. iv. of Policy SWDP 21 of the SWDP which provides that, amongst other things, development should not be unduly overbearing.

Highway safety

14. The submitted plans show 3 off-street car parking spaces to be provided in front of No 47B, plus an access drive providing access to the proposed car parking space to the rear of No 47B (intended for use by users of the proposed annex). The plans also show 3 off-street parking spaces in front of No 49B. In this regard, part B. xi. of Policy SWDP 21 of the SWDP makes clear that applications should address matters relating to appropriate facilities, including that satisfactory access and provision for the parking, servicing and manoeuvring of vehicles should be provided in accordance with the recognised standards.
15. Whilst the appellant has asserted that off-street car parking spaces have been in existence in this location for many years, no evidence has been provided to substantiate this. Apart from the proposed parking space to the rear of No 47B referred to above, no dimensions have been provided for the car parking spaces proposed. As such, it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would comply with paragraph 8.3.33 of the SPD which, amongst other things, specifies the required dimensions for car parking spaces. The lack of information provided in these respects means that the requirements of part B. xi. of Policy SWDP 21 referred to above have not been fulfilled.
16. Nevertheless, the proposed development does not seek to alter the parking arrangements for No 49B. These would remain as existing. Additionally, I observed that the parking area to the front of No 47B contains sufficient space for at least 2 cars to park. The proposed annex would be provided with its own parking space, meaning that users of the annex would not be required to use the parking areas in front of either No 49B or No 47B.
17. In these circumstances, at most the proposed development might result in the loss of one parking space to the front of No 47B, due to the use of the proposed access. I observed that space for on-street parking was available near to the site. Whilst only a 'snapshot' in time, I have not been referred to any evidence which demonstrates that my observations were untypical.

18. In this context, on a balance of probabilities, it would be unlikely that the displacement of parking caused would result in potentially dangerous on-street parking in the local area. In reaching this finding, I am mindful that paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) provides that, amongst other things, development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety. In the particular circumstances of this case, the proposed development's conflict with part B. xi. of Policy SWDP 21 has therefore been given limited weight.
19. I therefore find that the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on highway safety. It would comply with Policy SWDP 4 of the SWDP which provides that, amongst other things, proposals must demonstrate that they address road safety.

Other Matters

20. The finding on the 3rd main issue above, in relation to highway safety, is a neutral matter, which does not weigh in favour of the proposed development.
21. Mention has been made of grants of planning permission at other properties for annexes of the same design as that proposed. However, as no details of the planning permissions have been provided, it has not been demonstrated that these examples are directly comparable with the proposed development. This matter does not change my findings on the main issues above.

Other Considerations and Planning Balance

22. As mentioned above, the proposed development's conflict with part B. xi. of Policy SWDP 21 has been given limited weight. However, this finding does not overcome the significant weight given to the proposed development's conflict with the other relevant policies identified on the 1st and 2nd main issues above.
23. None of the relevant material considerations, including the benefit of additional living accommodation on site and the economic benefits arising from the construction phase, indicate that this appeal should be decided otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

24. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, the approach in the Framework, and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alexander O'Doherty

INSPECTOR