



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2024

by Elaine Benson BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H1840/D/24/3355420

5 Stable Court, Galton Way, Hadzor, Worcestershire WR9 7EX

- 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 Hassall against the decision of Wychavon District Council.
 - The application Ref is W/24/01300/HP.
 - The development proposed is the construction of single storey extension - Flat roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The appeal site lies outside a defined development boundary and is therefore within the open countryside where development is strictly controlled, in accordance with South Worcestershire Development Plan (SWDP) Policy SWDP2. LP Policy SWDP2C identifies exceptions to these controls, including house extensions. There is therefore no dispute that the appeal proposal is acceptable in principle in this location. There are no reasons to disagree.
3. Accordingly, the main issues in this appeal are the effect of the appeal proposal on the character and appearance of the host property, whether it would preserve the setting of the nearby listed buildings and its effect on their significance.

Reasons

4. The appeal proposal is for a single storey extension to 5 Stable Court (No 5). It stands in a courtyard of converted stables around the centrally located former Chimney Test House building. This development is part of the Clock Tower House which lies within the curtilage of Hadzor Hall, a Grade II Listed Building. The appeal site also lies within the setting of the Grade II Listed St John the Baptist Church.
5. The historic character and aesthetic of the group of buildings comprising the Hadzor Estate are derived from its past uses which make it distinctive and include its visual aspects, features, materials and the spaces associated with its history. The scale and 'grain' of the original configuration and the functional relationships of the buildings have for the large part been retained and reflected in later developments at the wider site.
6. This Decision reflects the statutory obligation to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings and their settings. The policy objectives in

the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) and the related guidance in the Planning Practice Guide (PPG) establish that the settings of listed buildings can contribute to the significance of heritage assets and can allow that significance to be appreciated. Such significance can be compromised by unsympathetic development affecting its setting.

7. The siting of the proposed extension would introduce a projection from the elevation which would contrast with the simple, formal courtyard layout. Although the proposed extension would not exceed the height of the main roof of the host property, its eaves height would be greater. Furthermore, the proposed flat roof with a roof lantern projecting above it would appear out of context with the built form of No 5 and that of the courtyard. Overall, the extension would not be a subservient addition, would appear unduly dominant and would not respect its design context, thereby harming the appearance of No 5 and its wider surroundings.
8. As a result of the proposed extension, the two larger windows which serve the living room would no longer be visible from outside the property, notwithstanding that one would be retained as an internal window opening. In my judgement these windows make a significant contribution to the character and appearance of No 5. Their size and design also reflect the cohesive appearance of windows within the Clock Tower House development and the wider area. The proposed extension windows would match the size and design of the narrow window that would remain at the side of the entrance door. However, they would be out of keeping with the size and style of the larger windows in the building, including the two bedroom windows. Accordingly, the character and appearance of No 5 and the Clock Tower House development when viewed as a whole would be harmed.
9. When assessing the contribution of setting to the significance of heritage assets, and how that significance can be appreciated, the consideration of views of or from a heritage asset is an important factor. However, this does not depend on there being public access to experience that setting. Furthermore, the way in which an asset is experienced in its setting is not limited to views but is also influenced by factors including an understanding of the historic relationship between places. But in any event, the extension would be on the grassed garden which is partially open to public view.
10. As a result of the proposed extension, No 5 would no longer reflect or respect the simple, functional courtyard character and appearance of the Clock Tower House. I conclude that the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the setting and significance of the designated heritage asset. The extension would provide additional accommodation for the appellant which would also be available to future occupiers. However, this is a private benefit of the proposal and no public benefits have been identified which would outweigh the identified harm to the setting of the listed building.
11. Overall, I conclude that the proposal is contrary to SWDP Policies SWDP6, SWDP21 and SWDP24 which, in summary and of relevance to this appeal, require development to be of high design quality, to integrate effectively with its surroundings in terms of form and function, to reinforce local distinctiveness and to conserve, and where appropriate, to enhance cultural and heritage assets and their settings. There would be further conflict with the advice set out in the Design Guide

SPD. The proposal also fails to accord with the design and heritage requirements of the Framework and the PPG.

12. In terms of other matters, due to the separation distance, difference in levels and intervening landscaping, the location, size and scale of the proposed development would preserve the setting of the Grade II Listed St John the Baptist Church. The appeal site is washed over by the Hadzor Hall Tree Preservation Order. However, the proposal is at a sufficient distance from the protected trees, including their root protection zones, to prevent any adverse impacts on them.
13. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

Elaine Benson

INSPECTOR