



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2017

by Siobhan Watson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/J1860/D/17/3181877

Hazel Cottage, Hook Bank, Hook Bank, Hanley Castle, WR8 0AY

- 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 Watkins and Ms Webb against the decision of Malvern Hills District Council.
 - The application Ref 17/00689/HP, dated 18 April 2017, was refused by notice dated 18 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is the removal of the existing porch and bay window to side elevations. Erection of a two-storey side extension and erection of a single storey front and side extension. External alterations including replacement windows, new roof-lights, removal of doorway and insertion of a window.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extensions upon the character and appearance of the countryside.

Reasons

3. The existing dwelling is surrounded on three sides by open landscape. There is a dwelling next door and some other sparse and sporadic residential development in the wider area.
4. The proposed render would not, in itself, be inappropriate in the area, given the existence of other rendered dwellings. Neither do I consider that any of the elevational details would be inappropriate to the existing residential design.
5. However, whilst the two storey extension would be set back a little from the front elevation and the ridge of the extended roof would be lower than the existing, the extensions would dramatically increase the width, mass and depth of the house. The extensions would be highly visible from the road and fields in front of the house and from the east along Upper Hook Road. I note the appellant's comments that the extensions would be smaller than the existing house. However, they would significantly enlarge the dwelling and the substantial degree of built development that would result would have an urbanising and detrimental impact upon the open nature of the rural landscape. Therefore, the extensions would fail to reinforce local distinctiveness.
6. I have had regard to the appellant's comments about the Council's former "House Extensions" Supplementary Planning Document, but for the reasons

above, I consider that the extensions would be unacceptable. I also note the appellant's argument that the same amount of width could be added to the house under Permitted Development rights. However, the diagram the appellant has supplied to demonstrate this denotes extensions lower than the proposed two-storey side extension and therefore, the visual impact of a permitted development scheme would be less striking.

7. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the countryside. Consequently, it would conflict with Policy SWDP 21 of the South Worcestershire Development Plan (2016) which indicates that the scale, height and massing of development must be appropriate to the setting of the site and the surrounding landscape character. It would also be contrary to Paragraphs 17, 56 and 57 of the National Planning Policy Framework which, in combination encourages good design and the protection of the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.
8. For the above reasons, I dismiss the appeal.

Siobhan Watson

INSPECTOR