



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2006

by **D W Jenkins BA DipTE CEng MICE MIHT**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for
Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN
☎ 0117 372 6372
e-mail: enquiries@planning-inspectorate.gsi.gov.uk

Date: 31 October 2006

Appeal Ref: APP/R1845/A/06/2017937

6 Coningsby Drive, Kidderminster, Worcestershire DY11 5LU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr A Bicknell against the decision of Wyre Forest District Council.
- The application (Ref 06/0314/FULL dated 14 March 2006) was refused by notice dated 13 April 2006.
- The development proposed is a first floor front extension.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Reasons

2. The appeal property is the easternmost unit in a staggered row of five pairs of semi-detached houses. The first three pairs are of basically similar appearance, with flat roofed single storey projections on their front elevations that were originally part of the integral garages. No. 6 was extended at the front in 1992 to accommodate a cloakroom and the garage was converted to habitable accommodation. Indeed, most of the dwellings in the group have been altered to some degree, with various minor front additions, but there are no first floor extensions on the front elevations.
3. The Appellant now wishes to erect a bedroom extension at first floor level over the existing flat roofed section. He contends that the proposal would complement and respect adjacent development, but it strikes me that the gabled roof addition would appear incongruous in relation to the neighbouring houses, and thereby be harmful to the street scene.
4. Furthermore, the house is set above the road and is opposite the junction with Audley Drive. It is, therefore, relatively prominent, so that the extension would be noticeable from a distance, thus exacerbating its adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area.
5. I appreciate that the street scene should not be viewed in isolation, and that there is a two-storey gabled element at 1 Seymour Road, which adjoins the appeal property on its eastern side. The Council points out that this latter property was extended well before current policies were adopted with the aim of securing improvements in the design of such extensions. I find that argument persuasive, but even were that not the case, I believe this proposed addition would unbalance the pair of semi-detached houses, and fail to be subservient to them, to such an extent as to be unacceptable.
6. Policy D.1 of the adopted Wyre Forest District Local Plan requires new development to complement and respect any adjacent development, amongst other matters. The extended dwelling would contrast too sharply with the other houses in the row to comply with that

requirement, in my view. Nor would it clearly relate to the surrounding townscape as required under Policy D.3. Furthermore, Policy D.13 stipulates that residential extensions should be in keeping with the form of the original building, be subservient to it, and not create incongruous features. I believe this proposal breaches all of those criteria and therefore fails to accord with all three of the Local Plan policies cited.

7. The Council has submitted an extract from its supplementary planning guidance 'Design Quality'. I have not been advised as to the status of this SPG, for example as to whether or not it was formally adopted after public consultation. I therefore afford it lesser weight than might otherwise have been the case. Nevertheless, it is material that I agree with the Council that this proposal conflicts with sections (i), (iii) and (vi) of paragraph 3.47 and with paragraph 3.49 of that document.
8. The occupiers of properties in Seymour Road are concerned about loss of light and visual intrusion. Although the Committee report states that the side elevation to 6 Coningsby Drive is approximately 15m from the rear of 1 Seymour Road, it was agreed during my visit that it is rather nearer. That mistake may well have arisen because the extension to that latter property is not shown on the Ordnance Survey plan that accompanied the application, but in any case I do not feel that the development would be so intrusive or cause such loss of light as to warrant withholding planning permission for those reasons.
9. Even so, I find the proposal unacceptable because of its harmful impact on the street scene.

David Jenkins

INSPECTOR