



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 May 2020

by B Davies MSc FGS CGeol

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 May 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F1610/D/20/3244425

The Haven, Road from B4070 to Cirencester Road, Birdlip, GL4 8JH

- 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 Dr J Lambert against the decision of Cotswold District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/02982/FUL, dated 8 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is double garage with fully glazed walk-through from study to garage. Ancillary Accommodation above.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. Housing on the main street around the site is of varying age and architectural style, but displays a consistent finish of Cotswold stone and light-coloured render, the exception being a single building with facing brick along the street from the site. Use of red brick would be out of character for the area and in conspicuous contrast to the surrounding buildings in a prominent location. In addition, the proposed double garage doors and rooflights in the front elevation would be in contrast with the open, fenestrated frontages of other houses along the road. Policy EN2 of the Cotswold District Local Plan 2011-2031 (adopted 2018) requires that development is consistent with the adopted Cotswold Design Code (Appendix D of the Local Plan). Whilst this allows for contemporary architecture, in not making strong local references or clearly respecting the Cotswold vernacular, I do not consider the proposal meets this Code.
4. Few garages can be observed from the public domain but where visible these are typically set back, detached, of single width and clearly subservient to the respective host house. The garage structure would be forward of the principal front elevation of the house and in height would reach the eaves of the building. It would therefore not be subservient to the host house and would not reflect the character of other ancillary buildings locally. The Code recommends that garages are placed at the rear of the building and that extensions should not compete with the original structure. In position and scale, the proposal

would therefore not reflect prevailing character and would not be in line with the Code, causing further conflict with Policy EN2.

5. I have taken into consideration that the development would replace an old asbestos garage. Given the form and position of this garage its removal may improve the appearance of the area and increase side access for the neighbour, but the benefits from this would be limited and insufficient to outweigh the harm identified above.
6. I conclude that there would be harm to the character and appearance of the area, in conflict with Policies EN1 and EN2 of the Local Plan, which together seek to achieve a high quality of design that respects the quality of the area.

Other Matters

7. The application was for ancillary accommodation. The Council has raised concern that that the building would be used as an independent unit of accommodation, but such use would in any case require separate planning permission.
8. I have noted reference to a listed building on the opposite side of the road. No further information has been provided, but as I am dismissing the appeal, I have not considered potential harm to its setting from the development.

Conclusion

9. For these reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

B Davies

INSPECTOR