The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 December 2018

by Ben Plenty BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18th January 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/J1860/D/18/3216414
The Cottage, Ankerdine Hill, Knightwick WR6 5PN

- 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 Calvin Hewitt against the decision of Malvern Hills District Council.
- The application Ref 18/01233/HP, dated 26 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 6 November 2018.
- The development proposed is single storey kitchen extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The site sits in an elevated position, about halfway up Ankerdine Hill. The dwelling is relatively isolated and has no immediate neighbours. Its main garden is to the front of the building, which is itself enclosed by hedging. It is a sloping site with a footpath crossing the southern part, rising up and around the site before returning to the road. Despite the boundary hedging, this path affords views in toward the front garden and main front elevation.

4. The dwelling is a traditional, two storey brick property. The front elevation has a balanced arrangement of windows. On the ground floor there is a bay window and French doors, with simpler windows above. A front door and small canopy are located in the centre of the front elevation. The dwelling includes chimneys on both of its flank elevations, providing a decorative and functional bookend to the sides of the building. Despite it not being listed or in a conservation area, this attractive rural cottage with its pleasing symmetrical form and traditional character, makes a positive contribution to the rural character and appearance of the area.

5. The proposal would add a flat roof single storey extension to part of the side and front of the dwelling. This would include a stone retaining wall (adjacent to the eastern embankment) and glass walls to the front and side. It would stand forward of the main front elevation. While the principal of a contemporary form is accepted, and I note that an earlier permission has been granted for a side extension, it is important that it be incorporated in a way sympathetic to the existing property and its traditional form. I find that this proposal would be

connected to the existing dwelling in a discordant manner, bearing little resemblance to the main building in terms of building lines or form.

6. Furthermore, the proposal includes the removal of the existing bay window and the eastern chimney. I find that the impact on the front elevation would be significantly harmful through the loss of traditional features. Overall, I find the proposal to be out of keeping with the balance, window arrangement and general form of the existing dwelling. It would materially harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area.

7. As such, the proposal would not accord with Policy SWDP21 of the South Worcestershire Development Plan (2016) which requires development to integrate well with its surroundings. Moreover, the proposal would not accord with Policy MKD3 of the Martley, Knightwick & Doddenham Neighbourhood Plan, or the South Worcestershire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, both of which seek to resist development that would not enhance or reinforce local distinctiveness.

Other Matters

8. I recognise that a side extension has been recently approved that would use the same materials as proposed for the current scheme. However the materials used is of limited relevance, as this is not a key issue in this case. In any event I must consider the appeal scheme on its own merits.

9. I also understand that the previously approved extension required substantial excavation. The current proposal is presented as requiring less earth extraction. The revised scheme is offered as being a reduced cost to the appellant and reducing highway congestion as fewer HGV movements would be required to remove material. I attach limited weight to these benefits, which do not outweigh the harm I have identified above to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all matters before me, the appeal is dismissed.

Ben Plenty

INSPECTOR