



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2009

**by D J Barnes MBA BSc(Hons) DipTP 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:  
4 August 2009**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R1845/A/09/2103701  
255 Hoo Road, Kidderminster, DY10 1LY**

- 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 H Wase against the decision of Wyre Forest District Council.
- The application Ref 08/0956/FULL, dated 27 October 2008, was refused by notice dated 11 December 2008.
- The development proposed is 2-storey side extension with a pitched roof over ground floor extension to replace a flat roof and detached garage in the rear garden.

---

## Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

## Procedural Matter

2. Although the appeal form refers to Mr H Vase, the appellant's name stated on the application form is Mr H Wase and I have adopted this name.

## Main issue

3. I consider that the main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, in particular by reason of its scale.

## Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises a 2 storey semi-detached house occupying a corner site at the junction of Hoo Road and Oakhill Avenue. The proposed development includes the erection of a 2 storey side extension partially on the site of a now demolished single storey side extension. A detached single garage has already been erected within the rear garden with access from Oakhill Avenue. The Council has granted planning permission for the erection of a single storey extension generally on the same footprint as the proposed 2 storey extension (Ref 09/0009/FULL).
5. Policy D.1(d) of the Wyre Forest District Local Plan (LP) requires the design of new development to maximise the use of corner plots and have appropriate regard to the common building line. The siting of the approved scheme breaches the building line along Oakhill Avenue. Although the siting of the proposed extension would breach the same line, in my view the siting of the approved scheme should be given significant weight and I consequentially consider that the appeal scheme would not materially conflict with LP Policy D.1(d).

6. Although the siting of the appeal and approved schemes would share the same general footprint, the scale and design of the proposed extension would be materially different, in particular its height and bulk would be larger than the approved scheme. I accept that the design of the appeal scheme would include a first floor step back as part of the front elevation and a lower hipped roof form which would provide the proposed extension with some degree of subservience to the host building. However, I consider that the scale of the proposed extension of itself would be significant and it would be out of scale with the host building. The scale of the proposed extension would also harm the symmetry and visual balance of the semi-detached dwellings which would be incongruous in the streetscene.
7. By reason of its scale, I consider that the proposed extension would be overly prominent on this corner plot and would be visually harmful to the streetscene, particularly when viewed from the north along Hoo Road and from the west along Oakhill Avenue. The visual prominence of the proposal and its discordant effect in the streetscene would be accentuated by the proximity of the 2 storey flank wall to the footway along Oakhill Avenue.
8. In my view, the appeal scheme would be out of character with similar forms of residential development within the surrounding area which generally comprise 2 storey semi-detached houses linked at ground floor level. Further, the corner plots in the area have generally retained their side gardens and where buildings or structures have been erected they are only single storey. These corner plots, including the site, possess an open character and appearance. The proposed extension would erode the side garden between the host building and Oakhill Avenue causing material harm to the open character of this corner plot.
9. Although the proposed extension would not materially conflict with LP Policy D.1(d) this does not outweigh the material harm I have identified. Therefore, by reason of its scale, I conclude that the proposed extension would materially harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area and, as such, would conflict with LP Policies D.3 and D.17. Amongst other matters, these policies require developments to clearly relate to the appearance and character of the surrounding townscape and for extensions to harmonise with the existing townscape and not be incongruous. Accordingly, and having regard to all other matters, the appeal fails.

*D J Barnes*

INSPECTOR