



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 16 September 2008

**by Alan Boyland BEng(Hons) DipTP CEng
MICE MIHT MRTPI**

**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
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

**Decision date:
1 October 2008**

Appeal Ref: APP/R1845/A/08/2077403

25 Waterfront Views, York Street, Stourport-on-Severn, DY13 9BT

- 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 & Mrs McAdam against the decision of Wyre Forest District Council.
- The application Ref 07/1293/FULL, dated 4 December 2007, was refused by notice dated 6 February 2008.
- The development proposed is a balcony and a canopy over the front door.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Conservation Area No.1, Stourport-on-Severn, within which it is situated.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located prominently facing the canal basin which is at the heart of the conservation area and around which a number of regeneration schemes have been undertaken or were under way at the time of my visit. No.25 is a 3-storey house with integral garage forming part of a modern building of unified design having the character of former warehousing converted to houses and flats.
4. No.25 is at one end of the building, and is set back by over 2m from the neighbouring no.24. The proposed balcony would be in the corner thus formed, above the opening to the garage. Although it would not protrude forward of the façade of no.24, it would be clearly visible from much of the canal basin and the quaysides around it. It would replace a Juliet balcony to the first floor lounge. Such balconies are a prominent feature of the building, being repeated throughout it and adding significantly to its character through symmetry and visual rhythm. A single balcony of the form proposed would disrupt these attributes and detract from the 'converted warehouse' character of the building.
5. The separate canopy over the front door to the property would be less conspicuous from most viewpoints, but such canopies are not a feature of this development and, again, would be inconsistent with its character.

6. I conclude on the main issue that the proposed development would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. It would thus be contrary to saved policy CA.1 (development in conservation areas) in the Wyre Forest District Local Plan and to saved policies CTC.19 (areas and features of historic and architectural significance) and CTC.20 (conservation areas) in the Worcestershire County Structure Plan.
7. While I have considered this appeal on its own merits, I share the Council's view that permitting the balcony and canopy proposed here would make it more difficult to resist other similar proposals in this building. Such developments would compound the harm the character to the building, even more so if they were undertaken piecemeal through individual developments rather than in a co-ordinated way with matching designs and maintaining the symmetry.
8. Finally, I note that the proposed balcony would be within 5m of the rear of the building to the west, 2a Bridge Street, which appears to be in residential use. Use of the balcony would be likely to give rise to noise, disturbance and loss of privacy to people in the ground and first floor rooms of that property.
9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Alan Boyland

Inspector