



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2025

by **P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J1860/D/24/3349369

Woodbine, Bransford Road, Rushwick, Worcester, WR2 5TD

- 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 Andrew Price against the decision of Malvern Hills District Council.
 - The application Ref is M/23/01524/HP.
 - The development proposed is Two storey extension at the rear of the existing house to create a new kitchen area and bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Subsequent to the refusal of permission for the proposed development the Government published its revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in December 2024. The wording of the relevant paragraphs of the new Framework are similar to that of the 2023 version. Therefore, it has not been necessary to seek comments from the parties on the revised Framework, which I have referred to in my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area, with particular reference to the impact on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA).

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a detached 2 storey house in a cul-de-sac with 4 other houses, accessed by a gravel driveway. The appeal property is orientated approximately west to east with a relatively wide frontage compared to the neighbouring houses. It is rendered to the front and sides but with exposed brickwork to the rear.
5. The Council has identified the building as a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA). As such I have had regard to Paragraph 216 of the Framework which requires that when determining an application, the effect of the proposal on the significance of a NDHA should be taken into account having regard to the scale of harm and the significance of the heritage asset.

6. The Council has not indicated which aspects of the building contribute to its historic significance but have referred in general to its age and character and appearance, which is variously described as a modest and simple rural dwelling with a linear form. I also note that some of its features appear to have influenced the design of the neighbouring houses in the cul-de-sac which was formerly part of the appeal property garden. These include exposed brickwork and first floor half dormer windows on the front elevation which extend to eaves height with a gable pitched roof projecting from the roof plane above.
7. The Council acknowledges that the appeal property has been significantly altered. Two, 2 storey gabled wings of different depths project from the rear of the house compromising its simple linear form. Much of the brickwork that would have originally been exposed has been rendered and the house has been integrated into a small residential estate which is part of the built up area of Rushwick village so that its original rural context has been lost. In my view, these changes have substantially reduced the historical significance of the building and as such I give this limited weight in my consideration of the appeal.
8. The Council's Design Guide Supplementary Planning - Overarching Design Principles (2018) (SPD) advises that extensions should reflect the character and style of the original dwelling and avoid a negative cumulative impact. The proposed extension would have a pitched roof that would run parallel with that of the main house creating a double gable at one end of the house which would unbalance its appearance and further erode the simple linear form of the original dwelling. It would also be out of character with houses in the area, none of which had double gable roofs. Because of its orientation, perpendicular to the existing rear extensions, rather than with its gable end aligning with them, its roof would appear awkward and disjointed and its walls would dominate the rear of the house. Whilst these changes would not be visible from the front of the house, little of its original character would be discernible from houses and gardens to the rear of the appeal site which are on higher ground and from where its roof and first floor are visible.
9. The proposed development would result in a cumulative negative impact that would harm the character and appearance of the building and thus conflict with Policies SWDP 21, SWDP6 and SWDP24 of the South Worcestershire Development Plan (2016), the SPD and the Framework which require development to be of a high quality design that complements the character of the building and area and enhances the significance of heritage assets.

Other Matters

10. There would be benefits in terms of additional living space and employment during construction. However, given the lack of evidence that such benefits could not be achieved by an alternative and less harmful proposal they do not outweigh the harm that I have identified. Other benefits described by the appellant, such as improved damp protection, could be achieved without the proposed development and, along with the lack of objections from consultees, do not weigh in favour of the proposal.
11. I note the appellant's concerns regarding communication during the application process, however, procedural issues such as this must remain a matter between the main parties. More particularly, my remit is limited to assessing the planning

merits and impacts of the proposed development, and I have reached my decision on this basis.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR