



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 December 2019

**by R Lankshear BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 23 January 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/J1860/D/19/3238302**

**Walsgrove Cottage, Home Farm Lane, Great Witley WR6 6JJ**

- 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 Charles White against the decision of Malvern Hills District Council.
  - The application Ref 19/00506/HP, dated 3 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 16 August 2019.
  - The development proposed is two storey bedroom extension and single storey kitchen extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

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

### Reasons

3. The appeal property is a single dwelling with fields to the north, south and east and a small group of trees to the north-west, that contribute towards an area with a predominantly rural and verdant character. The existing dwelling is linear in form with rendered walls and a red clay tiled dual pitched roof. The site is visible from the public right of way (PROW) running through the field to the south of the property, and from the edge of the nearby village of Great Witley across open fields.
4. The appeal proposal seeks to add a part two, part single storey extension to the western end of the dwelling. The two-storey extension would extend the northern pitch of the dwelling whilst the single storey extension would wrap around the front and side of the dwelling with a flat roofed area that would be utilised as a balcony.
5. Policy SWDP21 'Design' of the adopted South Worcestershire Development Plan 2016 (SWDP) seeks to encourage good design. This policy is complemented by the South Worcestershire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2018 (SPD) that includes advice with regard to the design of extensions including the need to be subordinate in scale; use of design breaks and use of matching materials unless justified.

6. The appellant indicates that much of the original character of the dwelling has been lost through previous remodelling. Although limited details have been provided of previous extensions and works to the dwelling, the existing dwelling maintains a simple and traditional appearance, with subordinate elements to its western end.
7. Whilst there is no specific policy objection to the principle of a residential extension, I note that the appeal scheme would extend the building considerably. Although I acknowledge that the guidance within the Design Guide SPD including the use of design breaks is not mandatory, the two-storey extension lacks architectural subtlety. The continuation of the ridge line in association with its significant depth would unbalance the property and would not, in my mind, appear subordinate to or respect the host property to the detriment of its character.
8. The single storey flat roofed extension, owing to its size and design would represent a discordant form of development that would be visible at least in part from the PROW. Although I acknowledge that the variation in materials is intended to provide a distinction between existing and proposed form, this would jar with the host dwelling and result in this element appearing as an awkward juxtaposition between the appeal proposal and the dwelling. This coupled with the proposed additional two storey mass would compete visually, rather than complement the more traditional form of the host dwelling.
9. Whilst I acknowledge views from the edge of the village would be relatively long range, closer views are afforded from the PROW. When viewed from the public domain, the depth and form of the appeal development would cumulatively dominate and unbalance the property. Although reasonably localised in its extent, the effect of the scheme would be to diminish unacceptably the character and appearance of the host building with consequent harm to the surrounding area.
10. Noting all of the above, I conclude that the appeal scheme would thereby run contrary to the design objectives of policy SWDP21 of the SWDP. In particular, the proposal would fail to reflect and respond positively to the particular characteristics of the site and the surrounding area. The proposal would also fail to reflect the guidance contained within the Design Guide SPD and that relating to design within chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **Other Matters**

11. It has been brought to my attention that owing to the design of the dwelling and constrained nature of the site that there are limited alternative options for extension of the dwelling. However, I do not find this a persuasive argument in favour of the proposal and have considered the proposal on its planning merits.
12. The appellant contends inconsistent subjective judgement on design issues by the Council including permitting housing developments nearby. However, I am not aware of the full circumstances relating to other development approved elsewhere and, in any event, I have determined this appeal on its individual planning merits.
13. I acknowledge the letter of support from the Parish Council; lack of objection from other consultees and neighbouring properties, although this does not alter my conclusions or the harm I have identified with regard to the main issue.

14. None of the other matters outweigh or alter my conclusion on the main issue.

**Conclusion**

15. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Robert Lankshear*

**INSPECTOR**