
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 May 2017

by L J O'Brien BA (Hons) MA

a person appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 02 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/17/3172356

Bank Cottage, Kilcot Road, Hillesley, GL12 7RL

- 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 and Mrs David Jones against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref S.17/0146/FUL, dated 12 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 15 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as "proposed replacement of shed with stone building with connection to house".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area; including the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Reasons

3. Bank Cottage, the appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling located within the open countryside on Kilcot Road; a fairly narrow rural road. There are a limited number of other residential properties in the vicinity of the site. The site is within the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and is apparent in views from a number of public vantage points including a nearby footpath.
 4. Bank Cottage is an attractive stone and rendered property with a number of visually pleasing characteristics such as the gables and chimney stacks. Whilst the dwelling has been constructed on level ground the land banks up significantly to the northern elevation. The proposal is to remove an existing outbuilding within the site's curtilage and replace it with a much larger building, built partially into the bank, which connects directly to the main house.
 5. In November 2016 planning permission was granted for an almost identical scheme. This permission is extant and forms a legitimate and strong fallback position. I am therefore determining this appeal on the basis of the differences between the two schemes.
 6. The proposal which is the subject of this appeal would have an increased height from that detailed on the approved plans. When viewed from the rear of the
-

property the ridge line of the proposal would be only slightly lower than those of the gabled projections. Due to this negligible difference in height the proposed addition would appear to visually compete with the host dwelling; diminishing the prominence of the attractive gables. Conversely, the set-down shown on the approved drawings would be just enough so as to generate a sense of subservience to the main dwelling.

7. A key difference between the two schemes would be the appearance of the side (northern) elevation of the property. This elevation is visible from Kilcot Road and other nearby public vantage points, including a public footpath. When viewing this elevation the ridge line of the proposed scheme would appear significantly higher than would be the case with the approved scheme. The excessive size would create a bulky and unsympathetic addition which would sit uncomfortably with the existing dwelling. An existing window would be partially obscured from view and the visually appealing chimney stack on this elevation would also be concealed to a greater extent than with the approved scheme.
8. The increased bulk, massing and ridge height would lead to a disproportionately large extension which would not appear as a subservient addition to the host dwelling thus harming its character and appearance. The proposal would also cause harm to the wider area and the AONB in this regard.
9. The development consequently fails to comply with Delivery Policy HC8 and Core Policy CP14 of the Stroud District Local Plan, adopted November 2015. These policies, amongst other things, seek to secure a high standard of design and ensure that the height, scale, form and design of any extensions are in keeping with the scale and character of the original dwelling and the site's wider setting and location.
10. Having regard to my conclusions on the main issue and all other matters raised, including the accessibility benefits and the appellant's willingness to use complementary materials, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L J O'Brien

APPOINTED PERSON