
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 November 2017

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 30 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/17/3181893

Lake Cottage, Lake Lane, Frampton-on-Severn, Gloucester, Glos GL2 7HG

- 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 K Collier against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref S.17/0899/HHOLD, dated 10 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 11 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is the renovation of existing dwelling including raising roof, and the erection of a single-storey extension and porch.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the renovation of existing dwelling including raising roof, and the erection of a single-storey extension and porch at Lake Cottage, Lake Lane, Frampton-on-Severn, Gloucester, Glos GL2 7HG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref S.17/0899/HHOLD, dated 10 May 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plans at scales 1:1250 and 1:500, and Drg Nos A001, A002, A003, A004, A005, A006 and A007.
 - 3) No development shall take place until samples of the external materials including bricks and tiles to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building works hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 4) Prior to the commencement of any works for which consent is hereby given, large scale plans showing the design, construction, materials, surface finish and method of glazing for the replacement windows shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The works shall be carried out and maintained in accordance with the approved details.

- 5) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations and conclusions of the Flood Risk Assessment dated 10 May 2017.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of Lake Cottage and the Frampton-on-Severn Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. Lake Cottage is a two-storey, brick-built dwelling of some age and traditional design, orientated perpendicular to Lake Lane with its end gable set immediately adjoining the back edge of the pavement. At the time of my visit it was unoccupied and in a poor state of repair.
4. I have been provided with an extract of a plan for the CA. This shows the appeal site located just within the boundary of the CA, which overall is reasonably expansive and diverse in its form. The Council's officer's report refers to the Frampton-on-Severn Conservation Area Statement (CAS) although I have not been provided with a copy of this document or any extracts from it. The Council says that Lake Cottage was one of five plots built along Lake Lane towards the end of the 19th Century within an area that was otherwise predominantly in agricultural use at that time. It now sits amongst a mix of old and new dwellings, including a new residential development immediately adjacent that was under construction at the time of my visit. Any association with its original setting and purpose appears lost and in my assessment the significance of Lake Cottage as part of the CA as an overall heritage asset is derived from its unique layout and simple form, which remains reflective of its past.
5. The proposal is to make the property habitable through its renovation. This would include removing a later, square-bay addition to the south elevation and replacing that with an open oak-framed porch. A new single-storey lean-to extension to the north elevation would replace a similar, ad-hoc structure of comparable size. The roof height would be raised with a new roof of steeper pitch with a similar alteration proposed to the roof of a single-storey wing to the side of the dwelling away from the road.
6. The Council is of the view that the increase to the height and pitch of the roof would detract from the existing 'cottage' scale of the property, making it appear grander and more akin to a standard modern executive home. I disagree and am of the view that the scale of change proposed has been somewhat over exaggerated.
7. The building would of course be taller, but not significantly so. The scale and height of the roof would be entirely proportionate to the size of the dwelling's principal elevations, which would remain unaltered. Although the roof pitch would be steeper, there is no evidence before me to suggest that its new form would be historically inappropriate for a building of this age. Indeed, I saw other dwellings amongst the mix of older houses within the CA with steep roof slopes, including on parts of Lake House immediately adjacent to the appeal property. Furthermore, the roof pitch and height proposed would reflect the

existing mix in the immediate area, including some of those I saw being constructed adjacent.

8. The works would involve replacement of existing chimneys, but the proposal is for this to be done in a replica form. There is no evidence to support the Council's assumption that these may be constructed with fibreglass or other synthetic materials. A suitable condition would ensure that multi-toned bricks could be used to reflect the appearance of the existing flues, which in all other respects are unexceptional. I agree with the Council that the success or otherwise of replacing the existing timber sash windows with UPVC frames is dependent upon their profile, thickness and the nature of the glazing bars. But this too could be controlled by condition. Some rooflights are proposed but these would be conservation style. They would not protrude obtrusively beyond the roof plane and neither would they be alien to the CA. A suggestion that the stepped front elevation to the property would be lost is unfounded, with the slight recess that exists clearly shown to be retained on the elevations and floor plans.
9. Lake Cottage is already prominent in the street scene due to its unusual position and orientation. However, its modest plan form would remain evident, as would its spatial setting and relationship with neighbouring buildings and spaces. Other simple detailing to the building would be unchanged, with additional benefit had from the existing painted brickwork being restored to its original form. There would unquestionably be change to the current appearance of Lake Cottage but rather than making the building somehow strident, as suggested by the Council, I find the alterations would be sympathetic to its architectural form, and complementary to its historic associations with the past and the contribution it makes to the street scene. I have noted the guidelines for development within the officer's report which have been quoted from the CAS. However, for the reasons given, I am satisfied that the changes proposed would not contribute to any cumulative harm to the character or appearance of the CA. I therefore detect no conflict with the guidelines that have been highlighted.

Conditions

10. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty. To safeguard the character and appearance of the area it is necessary to ensure that the new works are carried out in appropriate materials and which would match the existing. For the same reason it is necessary for details of the new UPVC windows to be agreed with the local planning authority.
11. The Council has suggested a condition requiring technical details to be approved for an air-source heat pump that is shown as proposed. However, I have been provided with no specific reason why this should be required with no information to suggest why this domestic facility may impact upon the living conditions of nearby occupiers. In these circumstances I consider that the imposition of such a condition would be unjustified and unreasonable.
12. To ensure that the development is appropriately flood resilient, it is necessary to require the works to be completed in accordance with the recommendations of the Flood Risk Assessment dated 10 May 2017.

Conclusion

13. I am satisfied that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of Lake Cottage. The dwelling would continue to have a positive impact upon the CA, thereby preserving its character and appearance without any harm to its significance as a heritage asset. There would therefore be no conflict with the aims and objectives of Policies CP14, HN8 and ES10 of the Stroud District Local Plan (2015) insofar as these deal with the quality of development, including for house extensions, and specifically the requirement for proposals to conserve heritage assets. For these same reasons I find no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as it deals with the same issues.
14. Accordingly, and in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR