
Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 11 October 2021 by B Phillips BSc MSc MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/21/3279060

Springfield Cottage, Catswood Lane, Elcombe, Stroud, GL6 7LA

- 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 Dan Quiggin against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref S.21/0811/HHOLD, dated 29 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is the construction of new rear single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing property and surroundings.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. Springfield Cottage is a traditional stone finished two-storey, detached cottage, which, whilst having been previously extended, retains a modest form and appearance. The property is located prominently on the main throughfare through the small settlement of Elcombe, which is mostly characterised by traditional dwellings and surrounded by open countryside. Given the topography of the site the appeal plot steps up to the rear.
5. The extension would project over the majority of the upper rear terrace garden area, but there would remain open space at the lower levels between the appeal property and its southern neighbour. In addition, there is land on the opposite side of the highway which it is indicated is used as garden and parking space by the appellants and was observed to be used as such. It is however unclear as to whether this land is formally established as garden area in land use terms, but in any event the land on the opposite side of the highway has not been identified as part of the appeal site and does not in any event read as direct curtilage within the setting of the existing building.
6. Whilst Cotswold stone walls are proposed for the extension, its contemporary design and part finish in contrasting materials such as larch cladding, combined with its position and relative height would give it a prominence and visual

impact that would dominate the character of the existing property. This would especially be the case when viewed from the highway, where, given the height, the L shaped design and large contemporary glazed area on this elevation, the extension would appear as a large and incongruous addition which would detract from the simple traditional form of the existing property. As a consequence of the scale and position of the proposed extension, the resultant development would appear cramped in the context of the appeal site and the extent of the existing dwelling and curtilage.

7. Whilst the rear of the property is partially obscured from view by the proximity of the neighbouring property and surrounding boundary walls and tree cover, the extension would be visible from the properties set on a higher level at the rear as well as from the footpath access to these dwellings.
8. The settlement is characterised by traditional vernacular dwellings, although the appellant has referred to examples of a modern (described as 1960's) dwelling set further up to the rear, in addition to a modern extension to a traditional dwelling. However, whilst visible due to its raised siting, the modern dwelling is set some distance from the highway and the extension is minor in scale and not therefore comparable in visual impact to the appeal proposal.
9. It is acknowledged that letters from nearby neighbours have been submitted in support of the scheme and the community benefits of the appellants remaining in situ. In addition, it is understood that the extension would improve the standard of accommodation for the appellants whilst retaining garden space, however, it would do so in a manner that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing property and surroundings, in conflict with the development plan. This matter does not provide the necessary justification to outweigh the harm from the development.
10. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed extension would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the existing property and surrounding area, in conflict with Policies HN8 and CP14 of the Local Plan, which seeks to ensure that the scale and design of the extension is in keeping with the scale and character of the original dwelling and its wider setting.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. The proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and surrounding area in conflict with the development plan. There are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

B Phillips

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR