
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 September 2024

by Rebecca McAndrew, BA Hons, MSc, PG Dip Urban Design, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J1860/D/24/3347285

1 Piers Close, Malvern, Worcestershire WR14 3JH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Gregory against the decision of Malvern Hills District Council.
 - The application Ref is M/24/00128/HP.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey extension to side, single storey extension to rear and dormer window to existing roof to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr and Mrs Gregory against Malvern Hills District Council and this is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The proposed two-storey side extension would be wider than the existing house and would span almost the full width of the appellants' side garden. I recognise that it would be set down below the ridge height and set back behind the front elevation of the existing property. However, due to its excessive width, this would do little to reduce the overall bulk and mass of the structure. Consequently, the proposed side extension would not appear subordinate to, and would unacceptably dominate, the host property. It would be at odds with, and harmful to, the character and appearance of the appeal site.
5. The property includes an existing catslide extension to the rear with a large expanse of tiled roof. I recognise that the proposed reduction in the depth of this extension, the addition of windows at ground floor level and the introduction of a dormer would add interest to this elevation. However, due to its significant depth, width and height, the proposed dormer extension would appear overly bulky when viewed in the context of the existing dwelling.

6. The proposed windows within the dormer extension would be a similar size to some of the smaller windows within the property and that they would align with the proposed ground floor fenestration. However, they would be out of scale with the large dormer extension. This, along with their alignment with the outer edges of the dormer extension, would give rise to an awkward window arrangement. Taking all of the above into account, the proposed dormer would appear incongruous and would be at odds with the character and appearance of the host property.
7. In conclusion, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the appeal site. It would conflict with South Worcestershire Development Plan (2016) Policy SWDP21, Policy MD1 of the Malvern Town Neighbourhood Plan 2015-2030 (2019) and the principles of the South Worcestershire Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2018). Taken together, these seek to secure high quality, sustainable development which is in-keeping with the character, scale, height and massing of the host dwelling.

Other Matters

8. In reaching my decision I have considered all matters raised by the appellants in support of the proposals. I recognise that the appeal scheme seeks to overcome the reason for refusal of a previous planning application. I note that the appellants consider that the previous refusal did not relate to the side extension. As such, the rear extension has been amended from the previous scheme, but the side extension remains largely the same. In any event, the Council's reason for refusal relating to this appeal proposal clearly refers to the side extension and I have found that both elements of the scheme would unduly harm the character and appearance of the host property.
9. I acknowledge that there would not be any impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and that the proposed materials would match the existing house. Also, the current level of on-site car parking would be retained.
10. On my site visit I observed that a nearby property, No 7 Piers Close, benefits from a side extension. However, it varies from the appeal proposal as it does not appear as overly wide in the context of the host dwelling or dominate it. Unlike the proposed side extension, it sits comfortably in the context of the existing house. As a consequence of these different circumstances, and also taking into account that each proposal must be considered on its own merit, I attach limited weight to this example in making my decision.
11. None of the other matters raised alter or outweigh my conclusion that the proposed extensions would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the site.

Conclusion

12. I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that would indicate that the appeal should be allowed. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR