



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 16 November 2021

by M. P Howell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Thursday 25 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/H1840/D/21/3282118

Deerfold House, Mill Lane, Wadborough WR8 9HB

- 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 Abercrombie against the decision of Wychavon District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01240/HP, dated 12 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 7 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'extend above existing garage to create home office and family accommodation.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. During the course of the appeal the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published. There are no substantive changes relevant to the appeal before me and therefore no party would be prejudiced by me having regard to the 2021 version of the Framework.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. Deerfold House is a detached dwelling in a rural location. The site is a spacious corner plot with no immediate neighbours, which can be viewed from the crossroads adjoining the plot. The garden space of Deerfold House is located to the front and side, with a tall hedgerow adjacent to Mill Lane and Wadborough Road. The pitched roof of the main house and three pitched roofed dormers are visible above the hedgerow. The roof is finished in clay tile and the elevations are a mixture of brick and render.
5. The existing detached double garage is situated to the north of the dwelling, but it is largely concealed by its single storey height, flat roofed design, and the boundary hedgerow. Consequently, there is an appreciable gap between the side elevation of Deerfold House and the Road, which in combination with the corner location provides visual relief from the built form. The uninterrupted visual break above the hedgerow contributes positively to the rural character and appearance of the area.
6. The proposal would be a curved, gambrel style roof extension. The roof would

principally form a north to south orientation and accommodate a bedroom and home office. Two dormers with a curved roof shape would be located either side of the main roof. The proposal would be finished in clay tiles, grey aluminium windows and composite cladding to the end elevations and dormers.

7. The extended building would retain the garage at ground floor with a home office and bedroom space above. The extended garage would have a smaller footprint and would be lower in height than the host dwelling. Having regard to its size and the proposed accommodation, I am of the view that the extended garage would appear visually subservient and would be used in an ancillary manner to the main house.
8. Although the extended garage would appear subservient to the host dwelling, the proposed roof extension would significantly add to the height, bulk and massing of the existing flat roofed garage. The orientation of the proposed roof, the curved design and the resultant bulk and mass would be at odds with the appearance of the host dwelling. Furthermore, the visual relief appreciable to the side would be diminished by the introduction of the built form rising above the hedgerow. This harm would be exacerbated by the prominence of the proposed roof extension from views to the north and south of the site on the Road, resulting in a discordant feature within the rural setting. As such, the siting of the garage together with the height, bulk and massing of the roof design would detract from the character and appearance of the area.
9. The appellant has drawn my attention to some ancillary buildings within the vicinity. However, due to the differences between these buildings and the proposal before me, in terms of their proximity to the road and host dwelling, as well as their design, they are read in a different context. There are no sufficient direct comparisons between these buildings and the proposal that weight in favour of the appeal.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, it would be contrary to Policy SWDP21 of the South Worcestershire Development Plan 2016, the South Worcestershire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document and paragraph 130 of the Framework. These policies seek to ensure that new development integrates effectively with its surroundings.

Other Matters

11. I have had regard to the previous scheme dismissed at appeal¹. I recognise the dismissed scheme has been amended to reduce the overall scale, height, and mass, but this does not alter my view on the current proposal. The changes made have resulted in a different scheme, which I have assessed on its own merits.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and taking into account the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Morgan Howell INSPECTOR

¹ Appeal ref: APP/H1840/D/21/3267338