

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2017

by Sarah Colebourne MA, MRTPI

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

Decision date: 14th March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J1860/D/17/3166541

The Beeches, Grimley, Worcester, WR2 6LU

- 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 and Mrs Saunders against the decision of Malvern Hills District Council.
 - The application Ref 16/01455/HOU, dated 5 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 30 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is an oak framed, glazed garden room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the building.

Reasons

3. Policy SWDP21 of the South Worcestershire Development Plan seeks to ensure that all development is of a high design quality and that it responds to the distinctive features that contribute to the visual interest of the area. The policy, in this regard, is in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to ensure that new development reflects its surroundings.
4. The Beeches is a converted barn in the rural hamlet of Grimley. It has a long, linear form, mostly of two storeys with a single storey element at the northern end. The conversion has successfully retained much of its former agricultural character such as the large cart opening and brick detailing which contribute positively to the visual interest of the building and the area.
5. A previous application for a single storey extension on the rear elevation was refused in 2015 because it broke up the linear form of the building. However, it seems that since then the Council's advice to the appellant has not objected to the principle, siting or scale of the proposed extension but rather to the form and detail of its design. The Council's pre-decision advice sought to achieve a more contemporary approach. Although the appellant suggested amendments to the proposed design, those were not considered acceptable by the planning officer and the application was refused on the basis of the submitted plans.

6. The proposed extension would be sited on the rear elevation and would not be seen from any public viewpoints. It would have a shallow hipped roof of clay tiles and a flat roof over the central part of the extension containing a roof lantern. The elevations would be wholly glazed within oak frames. The proposed garden room would be joined to the main building by a glazed link.
7. To my mind, the form of the shallow hipped roof would introduce an overly fussy element which would detract from the simpler form of the main building. Furthermore, its height and bulk would obscure part of a first floor window and bricked up opening which provide some of the building's character. The proposed roof form, together with the detailed elements of the design such as the roof lantern and the overhanging eaves, would give the extension a traditional appearance more suited to a traditional type of house than a barn conversion. I disagree strongly with the appellant's contention that the only alternative is a higher pitched roof structure with glazing. A simpler, perhaps more contemporary structure could reflect the linear form of the existing building and allow the building's important features and character to remain evident.

Conclusion

8. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the building and would fail to accord with the development plan. The appeal should be dismissed.

Sarah Colebourne

Inspector