
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 September 2020

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F1610/D/20/3254661

**Jesmond Cottage, 400859 Manor Barn Cowley To Bakers Farm Lane,
Cowley GL53 9NJ**

- 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 E Williams against the decision of Cotswold District Council.
 - The application Ref 19/03407/FUL, dated 12 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. There is some variation in the age and style of dwellings in Cowley. There have been modern alterations to some nearby properties and the appeal property has previously been extended. However, there is a degree of consistency to the cluster of properties where the appeal site is located with them generally being of a simplistic traditional form with Cotswold stone walls.
4. Differing materials are present at the appeal property. Nevertheless, other than some openings on the rear elevation, these have not significantly eroded the traditional style of the property. The side extension, while set back from the front of the property, largely retains the buildings' traditional linear proportions. Moreover, the catslide roof flows from the main roof and does not extend far beyond the original rear elevation.
5. The Cotswold Design Code does not exclude the use of contemporary materials. Nonetheless, the proposed combination of different materials on the same elevations would result in a confused appearance. Moreover, the scheme would use a range of window designs and sizes without any clear pattern. Furthermore, the flat roof element would be at odds with the sloping roofs typical of the area and the existing dwelling. This along with the introduction of 2 rear first floor projections of different lengths and widths would give a muddled and disjointed appearance to the property. This would be incongruous with the typically more simplistic form of dwellings in the area.

6. The extension would in part replace the existing single storey rear projection and the ridge line would be stepped down from that of the main roof. A generous garden space would also remain. Nevertheless, the increased bulk at first floor level and depth of the extension would result in it dominating the existing property where the gable elevation is seen.
7. Parts of the rear elevation would be largely screened from public views. Nevertheless, the corner position of the property means the inconsistency in the form, scale and materials of the extension would be highly prominent from the road passing the site, nearby properties and glimpsed views along the road to the rear.
8. There are timber outbuildings nearby and a prominent timber projection at Greenhatch Farm that also has large floor-to-ceiling windows. Nonetheless, the evidence indicates that Greenhatch Farm was a replacement dwelling rather than an extension. In addition, this feature is a single coherent protrusion on the front elevation, distinct from the remainder of the stone wall property. Therefore, it would not have the same mix of materials at different levels or varied protrusion sizes as the appeal scheme. As such, it is materially different to the scheme before me.
9. Consequently, the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. The scheme would fail to accord with Policy EN2 of the Cotswold District Local Plan and the Cotswold Design Code which seek to ensure that proposals be of a design quality that respects the character and distinctive appearance of the locality, as well as the proportions of the building.
10. It would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework where it states that development should be sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

11. I appreciate the proposal would provide additional living space for the appellant's family. However, these personal benefits are not a justification for setting aside the harm that the proposal would cause.
12. The appellant highlights that a single storey extension could be constructed under permitted development rights representing a fallback position. Nonetheless, there is no certificate of lawful development, little information and no specific design of such a proposal. As such, it is not clear what such proposals would entail or what effect they would have. In any event, the harm from the appeal scheme arises in part from the first-floor element. A single storey extension would not be directly comparable to the scheme before me.
13. I appreciate there were discussions over a more centrally located extension. Nevertheless, I have considered the proposal before me and found it would result in harm.

Conclusion

14. Therefore, for the reason given above and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR