



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 December 2024

by **B J Sims BSc (Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J1860/D/24/3349816

The Old Post Office, Coombe Green, Worcestershire, WR13 6AN.

- 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 Kevin Hawker against the decision of Malvern Hills District Council.
 - The application Ref is M/24/00373/HP.
 - The development proposed is demolition of previous extension and erection of two-storey rear and single-storey side extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for demolition of previous extension and erection of two-storey rear and single-storey side extensions at The Old Post Office, Coombe Green, Worcestershire, WR13 6AN, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref M/24/00373/HP, and subject to the conditions set out in the **Appendix** to this Report.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Old Post Office building and on the neighbouring property, Ivy Cottage, with respect to dominance and privacy.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The proposed extensions would virtually double the size of the pre-existing Old Post Office, exceeding the former footprint, including the previous ground floor extension, by some 16sqm. There would be a relatively prominent, pitch-roofed sun room replacing smaller mono-pitch conservatory on the existing southern main elevation and a dormer on the northern side of the extended dwelling, similar and adjacent to one existing.
4. The Appellant complains that the Council case officer failed to visit the site to appreciate the presence and location of an existing well that needs to be bridged by the new construction. Be that as it may, it is the overall scale and design of the extensions as proposed which are the primary considerations in this fresh appraisal of the appeal scheme.
5. There is no doubt that the main extension would not appear subservient to the existing main construction, despite a slight set-back of the main elevation and marginally lower roof pitch. However, I consider that, overall and despite their

substantial scale, the proposed additions would appear broadly in keeping with the present building in proportion and detail, whilst bringing the dwelling up to the standard required of a modern home. I note some differences in the shape of the proposed windows in the main elevation but they are of similar style to the modern uPVC windows in the existing building.

6. Despite its late 19th Century origins, the Old Post Office has been much altered over the years and is not evidently subject to any special protection as a heritage asset. On balance, I do not consider that the development now proposed would affect adversely the character or appearance of the host building to any greater extent than this has occurred already.
7. Accordingly, I find that the proposed development would be compliant with Policy SWDP21, criteria (i), (viii), and (x) of the adopted Development Plan with respect to its scale and quality of its design.

Ivy Cottage

8. Clearly, the extended Old Post Office would appear more prominent when viewed from neighbouring Ivy Cottage. However, I consider that the two are sufficiently well separated to avoid Ivy Cottage being dominated unduly. There is already a degree of mutual overlooking between the two properties and the development would add windows to the Old Post Office somewhat closer to Ivy Cottage.
9. I recognise that the first-floor bedroom window in the southern elevation of the main extension would be closer to the shared boundary than the adopted 10m guideline minimum. I do not consider that this would exacerbate any impact on privacy at Ivy Cottage to warrant substantive planning objection, again due to reasonable separation distance.
10. In this respect I judge the proposed development to be compliant with Policy SWDP21 criterion (iv) with respect to avoiding dominance and protecting privacy.

Other Matters

11. There are no objections with regard to matters of biodiversity, highway safety or drainage, subject to conditions. These include Condition 3, water management measures, Condition 5, low-level lighting to protect species and the dark landscape. Conditions 2 and 4 ensure compliance with the approved plans and the use of suitable finishing materials.

Conclusion

12. Overall, I regard the appeal proposals as compliant with the Development Plan as a whole, as well as national policy, with which the foregoing policies are essentially consistent.
13. I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, subject to the conditions outlined above.

B J Sims

INSPECTOR

**APPENDIX
PLANNING CONDITIONS**

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
2. Unless where required or allowed by other conditions attached to this permission, the development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with the information (including details on the proposed materials) provided on the application form and the plans Refs:
 - KH-OPM-RE-001 Rev A;
 - KH-OPM-RE-002 Rev B
 - KH-OPM-RE-003 Rev A
 - KH-OPM-RE-004
3. Prior to the first use/occupation of the development hereby permitted, the details set out in the submitted Water Management Statement shall be fully implemented and remain thereafter.
4. The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match/complement in type, colour, texture, size, coursing, jointing and pointing to those used in the existing building.
5. Any proposed external lighting details shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to installation, in accordance with the following specification: Low power LED lighting of corrected colour temperature not exceeding 2700K with brightness of 500 lumens or less, on directional down-lighters only, with 0-degree tilt angle and 0% upward light ratio, and controlled by means of a PIR sensor with a maximum over-run time of 1 minute. The approved lighting details shall thereafter be maintained for the lifetime of the development, with any defective lighting replaced 'like-for-like' in accordance with the above specification.