
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 July 2020

by S Shapland BSc (Hons) MSc CMILT MCIHT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J1860/D/20/3245468

Granary House, Upton Road, Callow End, Worcester WR2 4TE

- 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 Bryan Ratcliff against the decision of Malvern Hills District Council.
 - The application Ref: 19/01414/HP, dated 15 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is additional door and window to rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for additional door and window to rear elevation at Granary House, Upton Road, Callow End, Worcester WR2 4TE and the following plans: Drawing No. ARS002 Location Plan and Drawing No. RS001 Rear Elevation.

Procedural Matter

2. I observed that the development described above has already been carried out, and the application is retrospective. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issues is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a former agricultural barn which has been converted to residential use. The appeal relates to two new openings on the rear elevation, including a glazed door and a new window. The Council have confirmed that given the size and position of the proposed window they do not consider that this harms the character of the building. Based on my assessment and observations during the site visit I have no reason to disagree. Therefore, the remainder of the appeal decision will focus on the impact of the new door.
5. The appeal building is constructed of red brick with a plain clay tiled roof. Currently there are a number of fenestrations on the rear of the property, and it was apparent from my site visit that these form no uniform or regulated pattern. The Council have raised concerns that the proposed glazed door is out of keeping with the agricultural character of the building, by introducing an additional element of domesticity. Furthermore, its location adjacent to an

existing doorway makes the new door appear unnecessary and awkward in its positioning on the rear elevation.

6. I do not find this to be the case. The overall character of the building has retained its overall agrarian nature, although its conversion has clearly altered its character and appearance to one more akin to a residential dwelling. The new doorway has been finished in a timber frame which matches the other fenestrations on the rear of the building and as such I find that it integrates well on the rear elevation. Furthermore, given the irregularity of the fenestrations on the rear elevation, its location next to an existing doorway does not detract nor harm the character of the building. Accordingly, I find that the proposal does not harm the character and appearance of the dwelling.
7. I note that the Council considers that the appeal site merits consideration as a non-designated heritage asset. Paragraph 040¹ of the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) states that local planning authorities may identify non-designated heritage assets as part of the decision-making process on planning applications. It further states it is important that the decision to identify them as non-designated heritage assets are based on sound evidence. I note that the Council's Conservation Officer was consulted as part of the application.
8. Paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale and harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. I have been presented with no cogent evidence from the Council that the appeal site has been identified as a non-designated heritage asset. In any event, even if the site were considered a non-designated heritage asset, I have identified that the proposal does not harm the character and appearance of the dwelling, and as such does not conflict with the requirements of paragraph 197 of the Framework.
9. The appeal site is located within the setting of the Listed Building known as 'No.9 Upton Road'. As such I have had regard to my statutory duties under S66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. I find that the proposal is well screened from this listed building and there is limited visibility due to existing built development and therefore the proposal does not harm the setting of the listed building. Consequently, I find that it has a neutral effect on the significance of the designated heritage asset. I note that the Council raised no concerns in this regard.
10. Consequently, I find that the proposal does not harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling. I find no conflict with policies SWDP6 and SWDP24 of the South Worcestershire Development Plan 2016. Together these policies seek, amongst other things, that development conserves and enhances heritage assets. I also find no conflict with the South Worcestershire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document: Overarching Design Principles, which seeks, amongst other things, that development is of a high standard of design. I find no conflict with paragraph 197 of the Framework, which seeks, amongst other things that development does not harm non-designated heritage assets.

¹ Reference ID 18a-040-20190723 Revision date 23 07 2019

Conclusions

11. Having regard to all matters raised, it is concluded that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted.

S Shapland

INSPECTOR