

G HERBERT BANKS

EST. 1898

FOR SALE BY PRIVATE TREATY

**LAND ADJOINING SPRINGBANK, WELL LANE, LITTLE WITLEY
WORCESTER WR6 6LN**



GUIDE PRICE: £200,000

SITUATION

This superbly positioned property lies in a country lane in the sought after village of Little Witley. The village has St Michael's church and a village hall.

The surrounding areas including Great Witley, Shrawley, Holt Heath and the charming village of Ombersley are readily accessible.

These villages provide a number of amenities including junior schools, post office/stores, the well regarded Broomfield Farmshop & Café, Top Barn Farm Shop, public houses/restaurants and fine churches. Importantly the property lies within the catchment of the highly regarded Chantry senior school at Martley.

What 3 Words: ///brittle.hood.eternally

The Cathedral City of Worcester is about 8 miles distant with extensive amenities and direct rail services to Birmingham and London Paddington. There is also the well positioned Worcester Parkway railway station to the south of the city.

Excellent M5 motorway access is accessible via junction 5 at Wychbold and junction 6 at north Worcester.

The surrounding undulating countryside provides wonderful walks and countryside pursuits.

Planning

A copy of the appeal decision, 6000641 is attached to the sales particulars in connection with the application Reference M25/000976/PIP.

The development proposed is Planning Permission in Principle for a single dwelling.



RESIDENTIAL · AGRICULTURAL · COMMERCIAL

Chartered Surveyors & Estate Agents

01299 896 968 | gherbertbanks.co.uk | The Estate Office, Hill House, Great Witley, Worcestershire WR6 6JB



LOCAL AUTHORITY

Malvern Hill District Council

VIEWING

Anytime during reasonable daylight hours, with a set of particulars in hand, and having previously registered interest with the Selling Agent

MONEY LAUNDERING, TERRORIST FINANCING AND TRANSFER OF FUNDS (INFORMATION ON THE PAYER) REGULATIONS 2017

In order for us to legally comply with these regulations, we are obliged to obtain satisfactory evidence of identity and the source of funds before a sale can be reported. The checks will be carried out through CREDAS, and a non-refundable charge to each buyer (to include a private lender of funds) of £48 (inclusive of VAT) will be charged.



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2025

by **C Billings BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 December 2025

Appeal Ref: 6000641

Springbank, Well Lane, Little Witley WR6 6LN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant permission in principle.
- The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Rowley against the decision of Malvern Hills District Council.
- The application Ref is M/25/00976/PIP.
- The development proposed is permission in principle for a single dwelling.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and permission in principle is granted for a single dwelling at Springbank, Well Lane, Little Witley WR6 6LN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref M/25/00976/PIP.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposal is for permission in principle. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that this is an alternative way of obtaining planning permission for housing-led development. The permission in principle consent route has 2 stages: the first stage (permission in principle stage) establishes whether a site is suitable in principle and the second stage ('technical details consent') is when the detailed development proposals are assessed. This appeal relates to the first of these 2 stages.

3. The scope of the considerations for permission in principle is limited to location, land use and the amount of development permitted, as set out in the PPG. All other matters are considered as part of a subsequent Technical Details Consent application if permission in principle is granted.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the site is suitable for residential development, having regard to its location, land use, and the amount of development, with particular regard to proximity to key services and accessibility via sustainable travel modes.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is within the open countryside, outside yet adjacent to the settlement boundary for Little Witley. Therefore, in spatial terms, the appeal proposal would not safeguard the open countryside and would not be infill development within a defined settlement boundary. Consequently, the proposed development conflicts with Policy SWDP 2 of the South Worcestershire Development Plan (February 2016) (SWDP).

6. As set out in Annex D of the SWDP, Little Witley is a category 4B settlement, which has low/medium level of public transport provision and low services/facility Appeal Decision 6000641

<https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate> 2 provision. There are some local facilities within a short walk of the appeal site, including the village hall and church. Also, there are further facilities within the settlement that could be accessed via bicycle and bus within a reasonable distance. However, cyclists would need to navigate the busy A443 to access such and even though there are footways along the A443 from the end of Well Lane leading to the bus stops, Well Lane is a narrow, unlit rural lane with no footways. Also, the bus service operating along the A443 is not that frequent.

Therefore, the appeal site would not be that accessible to key local services and facilities via sustainable transport modes and there would be some safety concerns in using such.

7. Despite the above and even if the appeal proposal would not fully align with the guidance set out in the Worcestershire County Council Streetscapes Design Guide (2022) in terms of walking distances to bus stops and services, the proposal would offer some sustainable travel choices, as required of Policy SWDP 4 of the SWDP. Furthermore, as the appeal site is immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary and along the same linear route of this part of the village, accessibility via sustainable travel modes and proximity to key local services from it, would not be that different to existing dwellings located nearby within the village. Consequently, while it is likely that future occupiers of the proposed dwelling would primarily be reliant on private modes of transport to access local services and facilities, I do not find conflict with Policy SWDP 4 of the SWDP.

8. The Council has granted permission in principle for dwellings on other sites, elsewhere in the district, which may have similar location attributes to the appeal site. However, based on the information provided, these sites are in different locations and have different site contexts. Therefore, I have determined the appeal proposal having regard to its own merits.

9. The appeal site is large enough to accommodate one dwelling. Also, the density and pattern of development would be in keeping with that of existing dwellings nearby along Well Lane. Furthermore, the site is part of an existing residential garden which is largely contained by existing boundary treatments to all sides. Therefore, in terms of land use and the amount of development, a dwelling could be accommodated within the appeal site without causing harm to the character and appearance of the open countryside. Although, matters related to landscaping, access and other matters would need to be considered further at the technical details consent stage.

10. In view of the above, in terms of location, land use and the amount of development, with particular regard to proximity to key services and accessibility via sustainable travel modes, I find the proposal would not conflict with Policy SWDP 4 of the SWDP. However, due to its location outside the settlement in the open countryside, the proposal would conflict with Policy SWDP 2 of the SWDP. This policy, amongst other matters, seeks to safeguard and (wherever possible) enhance the open countryside and focus development on the urban areas, where both housing and accessibility to lower-cost public services are greatest.

Other Matters

11. Concerns have been raised by interested parties regarding vehicular access to the site and the impact this would have on highway safety and loss of frontage hedgerow. These relate to technical matters that do not fall to be considered at the Appeal Decision 6000641
<https://www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate> 3

permission in principle stage of development, although are matters that would need to be appropriately considered at the technical details stage.

Planning Balance

12. While I have found the proposal would conflict with policy SWDP 2 of the SWDP in terms of location and land use, the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land. This is stated to be 2.06 years as of 1 April 2024. In view of such housing shortfall, paragraph 11d) of the Framework is engaged. There are no protected areas or assets of particular importance and the proposal would deliver an additional dwelling, in an area where there is significant housing supply shortfall compared to the level required by national policy. I give significant weight to this benefit.

13. Additionally, the proposed dwelling would provide social and economic benefits associated with its construction and occupation. Even though such benefits would be relatively small for one dwelling and short term with regard to its construction, I give moderate weight to these benefits.

14. Furthermore, the appeal site is an existing garden area, adjacent to the village settlement boundary, within reasonable accessibility via sustainable modes to key local services and facilities. Therefore, the proposed dwelling would not be in an isolated location and, due to the existing use and enclosed nature of the appeal site, would not in principle, be harmful to the character and appearance of the open countryside. Consequently, the harm caused by the location of the proposed dwelling outside the settlement would be limited.

15. Balanced against the significant benefits of housing delivery, which is a key aim of the Framework, the adverse impacts arising from the proposed development by virtue of its conflict with Policy SWDP2 does not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework.

Conditions

16. The PPG advises that there is a default time limit duration of 3 years for a permission in principle and that, it is not possible for conditions to be attached to a grant of permission in principle. Also, as the proposal is for one dwelling, it would not be necessary to express a range to indicate the minimum and maximum net number of dwellings permitted in this instance.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, the proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole, although, material considerations, including the presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in the Framework, indicates that a decision should be taken other than in accordance with it.

18. Accordingly, the appeal should be allowed.

C Billings

INSPECTOR