



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2020

by J Gibson BUEP MPIA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/J1860/D/20/3254009

Myrtle Cottage, Drake Street, Welland, Worcestershire WR13 6LN

- 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 C Ball & Mrs R Tattersall against the decision of Malvern Hills District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00290/HP, dated 27 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a one and a half storey rear extension to existing detached dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its significance as a non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a rural property located towards the outskirts of Welland and comprises of a detached dwelling referred to as Myrtle Cottage. Myrtle Cottage has a historic character and appearance, which is subject to several extensions and surrounded by some ancillary buildings connected to the domestic and rural uses of the site.
4. The host dwelling has been described by both parties as a non-designated heritage asset. This has in part been attributed to the host dwelling being the historic village post office and for its traditional cottage design. Specifically, the steeply pitched gable roof, white render finish and black painted exposed timber frames are considered positive details which contribute to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Based on the evidence provided and my observations during the site visit I have no reason to conclude otherwise.
5. Despite the host dwelling being subject to several extensions I observed that it still appeared as the most prominent feature on the appeal site and maintained its visual primacy over the established extensions. The appeal proposal seeks to replicate the built form of the host dwelling, duplicating its general design, mass and scale into the rear garden off the existing rear extension. While the design style of the proposed extension would not in itself be out of keeping, the replicated mass and scale of the proposed rear extension would equate to a

significant addition to the existing built form that would harmfully erode the primacy of the host dwelling and fail to achieve an overall subordinate appearance. Furthermore, the parallel orientation of the appeal proposal to the host dwelling, and its location off the existing rear extension, would appear visually awkward and an unnatural extension of the established built form.

6. I note the appellants' contention that the existing rear extension to the host dwelling provides a sufficient "design break" to maintain the visual primacy of the host dwelling compared to the appeal proposal. However, I am not satisfied that this would amount to a subordinate outcome in this instance, given the scale of the proposed rear extension compared to the host dwelling and the cumulative effect of the existing extensions to the property along with that proposed. In my view, both singularly and cumulatively the appeal proposal would represent a disproportionate addition to Myrtle Cottage which would be visible from the surrounding landscape and along Drake Street.
7. Reference to the previous appeal decision on the appeal site is noted¹. Elements of this decision remain applicable to this case, specifically the description of the existing built form. However, whilst the existing rear extension has been designed in a way that could be read as part of the host dwelling it is clearly a modern extension as highlighted by the appellant. It is therefore material to consider whether the appeal proposal would appear as a proportionate addition overall to the host dwelling given the cumulative extent of established extensions. Furthermore, the fact that the proposed rear extension would not directly adjoin the host dwelling does not in itself mean that it would not affect the character and appearance of the host dwelling, as I have highlighted previously. As such, I have considered these matters, along with the identified harm, and the relative significance of Myrtle Cottage as a non-designated heritage asset in determining the appeal before me, based on its own merits.
8. Accordingly, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its significance as a non-designated heritage asset. It therefore conflicts with Policies SWDP 6, SWDP 21 and SWDP 24 of the South Worcestershire Development Plan (adopted February 2016), the South Worcestershire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (adopted March 2018), and Paragraphs 8, 124, 127 and 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework. These policies and guidance seek, amongst other things, to ensure development achieves high quality design that reinforces local distinctiveness as well as conserves and enhances the historic environment.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Gibson

INSPECTOR

¹ Appeal Reference: APP/J1860/D/19/3237659