



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 June 2021 by Ms S Maur

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/B1605/D/21/3275274

Site Address: The New Barn, Ham Road, Charlton Kings, Cheltenham GL52 6ND

- 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 Mark Casey against the decision of Cheltenham Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00052/FUL, dated 12 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 February 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first-floor side 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.

Procedural Matter

3. On 20 July 2021 the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). I have had regard to this as a material consideration however, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The issues most relevant to this appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the first-floor side extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area as well as the need to conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (the AONB).

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The site is a very spacious and open plot and includes a detached dwelling with timber clad and rendered facing walls and a standing seam metal pitched roof. The property is a converted agricultural barn, which has retained elements of its original structure, form and character of the barn, despite its adaptation and

- re-use. It has also been extended in the form of a single storey extension and single storey garage extension.
6. The subsequently approved single storey, flat roofed, extensions, although enlarging the footprint of the dwelling, sit comfortably alongside the former barn and allows the character, scale and form of the original barn conversion to be read without overbearing it. The site has a rural character and is located in the hamlet of Ham within the Cotswold AONB and has vehicular access from Ham Road. When seen from Ham Road, heading in both a northerly and southerly direction, the building is seen in a spacious plot with clear views over the flat roofed extensions creating an open setting. This retains the rural character of the existing building.
 7. The proposal consists of the erection of a first-floor extension, over the existing single storey extension which sits between the original building and the road. The proposed first floor extension would cover the full footprint of the existing single storey extension, excluding the garage. It would incorporate a pitched roof, perpendicular to the existing ridge line which would be similar to the height of the existing ridge. A recessed amenity terrace would be incorporated within the roof profile. A glazed first floor, flat roofed, link, above the entrance to the dwelling, with a standing seam roof would connect the first-floor extension to the main house.
 8. The proposal would result in a significant roof structure being added to the existing building. This would add additional bulk at roof level, close to the road. It would close off the views above the existing extension. This would erode the sense of space around the building at first floor level. Given its scale, it would appear dominant when seen alongside the existing building. This would diminish its existing character, which is derived to a significant degree, from the original barn structure being easily identified.
 9. Although the proposed roof of the extension would be pitched to match that of the original barn and matching materials would be used, this would not mitigate the harm caused by the scale of the extension. The height of the first-floor link would be lower and recessed. This would offer some separation and relief between the original barn and the proposed extension; however, it would nevertheless add to the overall bulk at roof height and detract from the form of the existing building.
 10. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment has been submitted which incorporates suggested mitigation measures. The conclusions of this assessment have been taken into account; however, in making this recommendation I must reach my own view on these matters. In this case, when the extension would be viewed from nearby locations it would jar with and detract from the intrinsic character of the existing building. The harm would be localised, with longer views not significantly affected. Harm to the character of the existing building, although only perceptible from a small number of vantage points, would fail to conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB. These areas have the highest status in terms of landscape protection and great weight should be given to conserving them.
 11. Examples of other extensions have been provided. However, these relate to a different context. For example, 1 Ham Cottages, does not appear to have been formed through converting a barn, rather it appears to have always been a residential property.

12. The development would follow much of the basic design principles in the Council's Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Alterations and Extensions (SPD). However, as the documents sets out, each proposal must be judged on its own merits. In this instance, harm would arise and the compliance with parts of the relevant guidance in the SPD would not mitigate or outweigh the harm. The development would not have any undue impacts on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, biodiversity or the highway network. These are neutral matters, rather than having positive weight in the balance of all the planning considerations.
13. For the reasons outlined above, the development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the existing building and area. Moreover, because of this, it would also fail to conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB. It would not accord with Policies D1 of the Cheltenham Plan (2020) and SD4 and SD7 of the Gloucester, Cheltenham and Tewkesbury Joint Core Strategy 2011-2031 (2017). Together, these ensure that development has a high standard of design with regard to the landscape character and that the scenic quality of the location is conserved and enhanced.
14. It would also not accord with Policies CE1 and CE3 of the Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan 2018-23 which seeks to conserve and enhance the landscape character and local distinctiveness of the AONB. Likewise, the proposal is also contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to achieve good design and conserve and enhance areas of outstanding natural beauty.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ms S Maur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR