
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2019

by S Shapland BSc (Hons) MSc MILT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/J1860/D/19/3229960

2 Dale Cottages, Brockamin Lane, Leigh, Worcester WR6 5JZ

- 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 Jeremy Morfey against the decision of Malvern Hills District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/00089/HP, dated 21 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 02 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as erection of single storey outbuilding side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a semi-detached cottage located within the rural area of Leigh. The property is located at the end of a single access track, some distance from the main highway. The property is set at a much lower ground level than the access track, with gardens to the side and rear of the cottage. The pair of cottages are constructed from matching brick material with slate roofs. They have similar design features on the front elevation which includes matching windows on the first floors. This gives the cottages a balanced and pleasing design.
4. The proposal is for a single storey side extension to the first floor of the property, which would include an element which wraps around to the rear. The proposed extension would be constructed on raised posts, which because of the site topography provides level access from the existing drive. The extension would be constructed from planed wooden logs, which would be stained brown to match existing outbuildings on the site.
5. The proposed extension would project beyond the front elevation of the host dwelling by a considerable distance. The scale and massing of the extension means it does not appear subservient to the host property, and causes an unbalancing effect to the neighbouring dwelling. The proposed gable roof would not match the existing roofline of the cottages, and as a result the proposal

would not integrate well with the host building. The proposal would also include two windows on the front elevation of the extension. These do not match the size and style of the windows of the existing cottage and therefore do not respect the character of the host dwelling.

6. The proposed wooden log construction differs to the existing materials of the cottage. I therefore find that the proposal is an unsympathetic addition. As such it causes harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
7. The appellant has indicated that the property could be extended without the need for planning permission. Be that as it may, I must determine this proposal on its own merits which is what I have done.
8. The pair of cottages is well screened by vegetation and are located a considerable distance from the public highway. Therefore the proposed extension would not be particularly visible from the surrounding area. Accordingly, the harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area is therefore minimal. However, this does not outweigh the harm I have identified.
9. Consequently, I find that the proposal would be an incongruous addition which would dominate the property. This would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling. This is in conflict with Policy SWDP21 of the South Worcestershire Development Plan adopted 2016, the South Worcestershire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document adopted 2018, and section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Together these policies seek, amongst other things, that development is of a high-quality design which complements the character and appearance of the site and wider area.

Other matters

10. I have been referred to several other developments in the local area which benefit from extensions which project forward of the main elevation. However, I do not have the full circumstances that led to these proposals being accepted so cannot be sure that they represent a direct parallel of the appeal proposal. In any case, I have determined this appeal on its own merits.
11. The appellant has raised concerns at the way the Council has determined the planning application at this site. This is not a matter within the remit of this appeal, and my consideration of the proposal which has to be assessed on its planning merits which is what I have done.

Conclusions

12. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed

S Shapland

INSPECTOR