



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2008

by **R J Eagle BA**

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:
13 January 2009

Appeal Ref: APP/R1845/A/08/2086655

**Rear of Nos. 2 & 4 Lyttleton Road, Bark Hill, Bewdley, Worcestershire
DY12 2BT**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr George Hyde & Mr Leigh Hyde against the decision of Wyre Forest District Council.
- The application, Ref. 08/0132/OUTL dated 5 February 2008, was refused by notice dated 31 March 2008.
- The development proposed is 2 No. semi-detached single storey dwellings.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal for the reasons set out below.

Main issues

2. The main issues are (1) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area and (2) its effect on road safety in Lyttleton Road.

Reasons

3. Nos. 2 and 4 Lyttleton Road are a pair of semi-detached houses on a residential estate. The proposal would construct a pair of semi-detached bungalows in the back of the rear garden of these two properties with access to the side of the house at No. 2. The ground slopes relatively consistently with the rear of the site being around 3.85m lower than Lyttleton Road. That slope continues with a further fall of around 9.46m to Woodthorpe Drive beyond the rear of the site.
4. The relevant part of Policy H.6 of the 2004 Wyre Forest District Local Plan (LP) says that backland development will only be permitted where there is no significant adverse impact on the character of the area, a safe access with a clear presence in the streetscene is provided and the proposal does not constitute tandem development. The Reasoned Justification to that Policy explains that tandem development involving the development of dwellings immediately behind others will not be allowed.
5. The surrounding area is characterised by predominantly linear development of houses fronting roads, whereas the proposal would be single storey dwellings with no road frontage. The houses on Lyttleton Road and the change in levels would largely screen the dwellings from the streetscene. However, they would

be glimpsed through the relatively wide access drive and be clearly seen from the backs of the houses on Lyttleton Road and the adjoining Ingram Crescent as an incongruous development.

6. The bungalows would face the rear of the site and the appellant says that accordingly the proposal constitutes back to back rather than tandem development. However, the bungalows would have no road frontage as they would adjoin the rear boundary of dwellings on Woodthorpe Drive and accordingly I consider their appearance would be that of dwellings immediately behind others.
7. There is sufficient width to the side of the house at No. 2 to provide a two way access to the bungalows and the appellant has submitted further plans showing details of the visibility at the entrance. I consider the access would have a clear presence in the streetscene and that visibility would be adequate and note that the Highway Authority no longer objects to the access.
8. I conclude therefore that whilst the proposal would not harm road safety in Lyttleton Road, it would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area and fail to comply with the requirements in LP Policy H.6 in respect of character and tandem development.
9. Accordingly the appeal should not succeed.

Roger Eagle

INSPECTOR