

**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**

4th January 2012

**APPEAL OUTCOME REPORT FOR INFORMATION**

**APPEAL MADE AGAINST REFUSAL OF PLANNING PERMISSION**

**PLANNING APPLICATION DETAILS: 2011/008/FUL**

**ERECTION OF A TWO BEDROOMED DETACHED DWELLING**

**LAND ADJACENT TO 656 EVESHAM ROAD, REDDITCH**

**WARD                   ASTWOOD BANK & FECKENHAM**

**DECISION            DECISION MADE BY OFFICERS UNDER DELEGATED  
POWERS 14TH MARCH 2011**

The author of this report is Steven Edden, Planning Officer (DC), who can be contacted on extension 3206 (e-mail: [steve.edden@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk](mailto:steve.edden@bromsgroveandredditch.gov.uk)) for more information.

**Discussion**

The case related to the erection of a new detached dwelling as an infill development between numbers 656 and 658 Evesham Road. The planning application was refused for the following reason:

1. The proposed dwelling, by virtue of its siting, design and appearance, would represent an incongruous form of development, failing to harmonise with the prevailing character, appearance and pattern of existing ribbon development along this part of Evesham Road. The proposals would fail to respond to local distinctiveness, and would have a harmful, adverse impact upon the visual amenities of the area. The proposals therefore conflict with Policies B(HSG).6 and B(BE).13 of the Borough of Redditch Local Plan No.3, and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Encouraging Good Design'.

Officers sought to defend that reason through written representations to the Planning Inspector.

The Inspector noted that substantial and visually significant gaps between dwellings in the immediate area exist and considered that this openness contributes to the character of the area. He considered that a sole detached dwelling set amongst semi-detached and terraced properties would appear incongruous in appearance, and that the depth of the proposed dwelling, being significantly greater than that of dwellings either side would be detrimental to the character of the area. He agreed with the Council that the failure of the scheme to reflect local distinctiveness rendered the proposal

**PLANNING  
COMMITTEE**

4th January 2012

---

inappropriate in its context considering that to allow the appeal would be contrary to local and national planning policy.

Appeal outcome

The planning appeal was DISMISSED. Costs were neither sought nor awarded.

Further issues

None.

**Recommendation**

**The Committee is asked to RESOLVE that the item of information be noted.**