
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2020

by R Lankshear BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/W/20/3251371

Hillside Cottage, B4066 from Pickwick Farm Junction to the Cattle Country Adventure Park, Berkeley Heath, Berkeley GL13 9EW

- 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 & Mrs W Harper against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref S.20/0039/HHOLD, dated 7 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'retrospective application allowing the built dormer windows and amended door location to remain'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Planning permission has previously been granted for the erection of a triple garage including basement and office above under permission S.16/0999/HHOLD. On the evidence before me including my site observations, the development approved under this previous consent appeared to be substantially complete. However, the application subject of this appeal sought to amend the design to include 3 dormer windows within the front elevation and an altered position of the first floor door and staircase within the rear elevation. The parties indicate that the footprint and height of the garage are commensurate with that previously approved and I have no reason to take a different view. The reason for refusal relates explicitly to the proposed addition of the 3 dormer windows within the front elevation, that the parties also indicate have been installed at the site and therefore the appeal is retrospective. I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the property of Hillside Cottage.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a detached two storey dwelling and accompanying land and building. The dwelling has a low eaves height with dormer windows to both the front and rear elevation, contributing to a generally modest and traditional character. The property is set in close proximity to the B4066 with

- clear views possible across the frontage of the property. The proposal seeks alterations to a previously permitted garage building including the erection of 3 dormer windows within the front elevation.
5. Policy HC8 of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan 2015 (LP) allows for extensions to dwellings subject to 3 criteria including that 'the height, scale, form and design of the extension or outbuilding is in keeping with the scale and character of the original dwelling.'
 6. I acknowledge the appellants comments with regard to the similarity of the dormer windows subject of this appeal installed within the front elevation of the building to those suggested within the Stroud District Council Residential Design Guide 2000 and those within the host property. However, to my mind the addition of these features increases the scale and prominence of this building to a significant degree. As a result, your attention is drawn to the building in a manner that visually competes with the host property and no longer appears subservient in its form, or in turn as an ancillary structure to the dwelling of Hillside Cottage. Although I acknowledge that to some extent the dormer windows are viewed against the approved roofslope, their addition results in an elevation of the status and prominence of this outbuilding in a manner that to my mind detracts from the character and appearance of Hillside Cottage.
 7. Whilst I note the variety in terms of building form and styles evident within the street scene, these however generally reflect their form and function. I also acknowledge the position of the main road to the front, although to my mind I do not consider that the presence of any these features outweigh or overcome the harm identified above and I have considered this appeal on its merits. As aforementioned the application as submitted also included alteration to the position of a door to the rear elevation. The Council do not raise any concern with regard to this element of the proposals and I find no reason to disagree in this regard.
 8. Having considered all of the above, the appeal proposal when considered as a whole causes significant harm to the character and appearance of the property. As such I find the addition of 3 dormer windows to the front elevation of the garage conflicts with the provisions of Policy HC8 of the LP that amongst other things requires that the scale and design of extensions or outbuildings are in keeping with the scale and character of the original dwelling.

Other Matters

9. Although I acknowledge that no objections were received from neighbouring properties or the Parish Council this does not outweigh the harm I have identified above.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Robert Lankshear

INSPECTOR