

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 1 December 2020

by Mr Martin Allen B.Sc (Hons), M.Sc, M.R.T.P.I

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/W/20/3257927

Pitt Court, North Nibley, GL11 6EB

- 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 Mrs Sarah Penfold against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref S.20/0587/FUL, dated 11 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as "The erection of a 12 m2 shed for storage within a 3 acre field. The land is used for the keeping of sheep and lambs. Current storage is in a barn on the other side of the field and with often wet and boggy weather, storage is needed on this side of the field as it is difficult to cross boggy lands with items needed for the keeping of sheep. There was an existing shed in close proximity to this area that was used for storage but this was dismantled due to incorrect advice from the planning department. The structure is made of natural materials which has been painted green to blend into the landscape. The established treeline obscures the structure from view from most positions. The site backs onto fields, no residential buildings are in close proximity meaning there is no overbearing effect nor loss of light or privacy to others."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The parties agree that the building has already been erected and so I have considered the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area, having particular regard to the sites location within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies at the corner of a field and occupies an elevated position, with views available to as well as from the surrounding countryside. There were views of the site from vantage points within the surrounding area due to the undulating topography present. The locale has an attractive, verdant appearance, with buildings generally arranged in clusters along and in proximity to roads.
5. The building is sited against the hedge line of the field and is coloured green, both of these factors serve to reduce the impact of it. However, it is positioned

away from other buildings and consequently appears as an isolated feature within the landscape. Despite its modest size, I observed that it is visible from local vantage points and appears un-related to other buildings. In this respect, it is an isolated and intrusive feature within the area. I appreciate that at times views of the building would be filtered by the presence of vegetation, however this would not be the case during the winter months and, in any event, this is not good reason to permit an isolated and solitary building within the landscape.

6. Accordingly, the building is harmful to the character and appearance of the area, including the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, in conflict with policies CP15, EI5 and ES7 of the Stroud District Local Plan (2015). Together, and amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure development does not lead to excessive encroachment away from buildings, that new buildings in a rural location are sited appropriately and that within the AONB development complements landscape character.

Other Matters

7. I note reference to the presence of a previous building near to the siting of the current one, which was removed following pre-application advice from the Council. However, I have no information of the exact siting of that building, or its size and thus I do not know the effect of it on the character and appearance of the area, including the AONB. As such, its former presence has little bearing on my decision. I acknowledge comments in respect of the previous building being removed from the site and that it was initially thought that the current building did not require planning permission, I am also mindful of comments that the appellant would be left in a worse position without the building. However, I have found harm with the building as erected in this location, sufficient to dismiss the appeal.
8. I am also conscious that the appellant asserts that the building is necessary in order to ensure feeders can be easily and regularly replenished. However, there is an existing storage building a short distance away in the adjoining field and as such I am not convinced of any overriding need for the additional building, even when noting comments that the existing land is wet.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mr Martin Allen

INSPECTOR