



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2009

by **James Ellis LLB (Hons) Solicitor**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State  
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate  
4/11 Eagle Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372  
email: [enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk)

**Decision date:**  
**3 February 2009**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/R1845/A/08/2088151**

**Bramble Cottage, Ribbesford Road, Areley Kings, Stourport-on-Severn, DY13 0TH**

- 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 M Hall against the decision of Wyre Forest District Council.
- The application Ref 08/0724/FULL, dated 27 July 2008, was refused by notice dated 17 September 2008.
- The development proposed is the erection of a first floor rear extension.

---

## Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

## Procedural matter

2. The evidence before me indicates that the appeal building already has planning permission, under Ref 08/0550 dated 15 July 2008, for the erection of a first floor rear extension. However, I will give little weight to this permission in making my determination because I have not been provided with details of it.

## Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of Bramble Cottage and the terrace of which it forms part.

## Reasons

4. The appeal property is a modest and attractive two-storey cottage in the middle of a terrace of three. It already has a flat roofed single-storey rear extension with a porch. The cottage is accessed by a private drive which leads from Ribbesford Road. It lies within open countryside within an Area of Great landscape Value/ Landscape Protection Area. Each of the neighbouring cottages has an existing rear extension.
5. The proposal is to erect a first floor extension over the existing single-storey rear extension at the appeal property. This would involve continuing the rear roof slope of the cottage into a catslide which would have a three pane dormer window inserted into it. The pitched roof of the dormer would also have some small roof lights. The extension would provide the cottage with a third first floor room which would be used as a bedroom. An existing bedroom would be

- converted to a bathroom. The extension would be constructed of materials to match those of the existing building.
6. The height of the dormer window would be about two thirds of that of the extended roof and its width, incorporating a three pane window, would also be about two thirds of that of the catslide roof. Moreover, the length of the ridge of the roof of the dormer would equate to about three quarters of the depth of the extended roof when measured from the eaves level of the proposed catslide to the ridge of the original roof. In my opinion, because of its size the proposed dormer would be out of scale with the existing cottage and be seen as a bulky and dominant feature, rather than a subordinate one.
  7. As such, I consider that the proposal would be very much out of keeping with the character and appearance of the existing cottage. In my view, this would be exacerbated in terms of detailed design by the three pane window in the dormer which would not match the existing two pane windows at ground floor level. Having regard to the above, and the proposal's location in the centre of the rear presentation of the terrace of three cottages, I consider that it would also have a significant adverse effect on the character of the terrace as a whole. I am mindful that the other cottages in the terrace have rear extensions. However, after carrying out my site visit, I consider the scale and design of these extensions are in keeping the character and appearance of their host cottages and the terrace as a whole. They can therefore be distinguished from the appeal proposal.
  8. I conclude, therefore, that the proposal would result in harm to the character of Bramble Cottage, and also to the terrace of which it forms part, contrary to saved Policies D.1, D.3 and D.17 of the Wyre Forest District Adopted Local Plan (2004).
  9. In arriving at my decision, I appreciate that proposal would remove the flat roof of the existing single-storey extension at the appeal property and that it would also provide the appellant with an upstairs bathroom without the loss of a bedroom. I am also aware that the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties would not be adversely affected and that there would be limited public views towards the proposal. However, in this context, I am mindful of national guidance in Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development which seeks to promote good design. I therefore consider that the points referred to above do not outweigh the cogent harm to planning objectives that I have found.
  10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*James Ellis*

Inspector