



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 September 2020

by J P Longmuir BA (Hons) DipUD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/F1610/D/20/3255569

Porters Farm, Wyck Rissington, Cheltenham, GL54 2PN

- 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 M Ransom against the decision of Cotswold District Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00841/FUL, dated 24 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 May 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of single storey extensions to side and rear, addition of roof lights, replacement of glazed doors with wall, and addition of flue, and erection of new garage/carport.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appeal site and description above are taken from the appeal form as they are more comprehensive.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of Wyck Rissington Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

- 4 The appeal site and environs are wholly within the CA and the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). There is no Conservation Area Statement for the CA, but its character is readily discernible. The CA covers much of the village, and the most distinctive feature is a long village green, alongside which there are vernacular cottages and farm groups in loose alignment and widely dispersed allowing views of distant countryside. The farm groups have extensive surrounding fields and this agricultural presence is of particular significance to the origins and prosperity of the village and the CA.
- 5 The appeal site includes an 'L' shaped former barn, which is now converted to a dwelling. It has retained much of its original agricultural appearance and is notable for its natural stone walling. Indeed, the Council describe it as a non-designated heritage asset, and I agree. Its rustic appearance makes a valuable contribution to the significance of the CA

- 6 Extracts of historic maps have been provided showing the buildings on the appeal site and the adjacent, in a distinctive courtyard shape. The historic footprint of these buildings is still evident. The buildings also have a discernible narrowness and low eaves height, commensurate with a barn like character.
- 7 The flat roof extension abutting the main section of the 'L' shaped building would be seen from a gap in the village street by the Old Farmhouse. The flat roof would contrast unfavourably with the adjacent steeply pitched stone tiled existing roof. Furthermore, the parallel siting of the extension would also not accord with the characteristic linear alignment and narrowness of the existing building. The simplicity and historic form of the building would be significantly undermined. Whilst I note a willingness to use natural stone rather than the originally proposed render for the extension, this would not overcome the concerns above. Similarly, whilst the neighbouring oil tank has been mentioned as a constraint but would not justify the proposal.
- 8 The proposed double garage towards the western edge of the appeal site would be close to an open field. Whilst there are some trees to the north of this intended siting, the western aspect is open. The garage and their associated cars would have a domestic character and appearance which would be out of keeping with the adjacent agricultural setting. Accordingly, the proposal would impair the agricultural influence on the character and appearance of the CA. Whilst the garage would be useful for domestic storage other options may be possible. I also note the appellants' offer of additional landscaping on the appeal site and the village green, but this would not remedy the harm.
- 9 Whilst the extension on the south wall of the main property would be modestly sized, it would nevertheless obscure much of the original stone and disrupt the simple linear form of the building. I note the submitted maps from 1902 and 1922 show a structure broadly on this particular footprint. However, I have not been provided with details about its height, whether it was open and its age. Accordingly, the presence of the former extension does not justify this extension now.
- 10 I acknowledge that the new rooflights, a flue and a new wall in place of glazed doors, would all be unobtrusive. However, for the reasons given, the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA. In the context of the National Planning Policy Framework the harm would be less than substantial. Nevertheless, when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. In this case, that harm is not outweighed by any public benefits of the proposal.
- 11 In view of the above the proposal would also conflict with Policies EN2, EN10, EN11, EN12 and EN13 of the Cotswold District Local Plan which seek to support vernacular design, protect the distinctiveness of the area, the character of buildings and conservation areas,

Other matters

- 12 The proposal is sufficiently unrelated to the setting of listed buildings to cause any harm. As the appeal site is in the built environs of the village, the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB would also be conserved. However, these findings are neutral considerations which do not add any weight in favour of the appeal scheme.

Conclusion

14 I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Longmuir

INSPECTOR