



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2022

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/F1610/D/21/3278649

Priory Cottage, Climperwell Road, Brimpsfield GL4 8LD

- 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 Jonathan Ticehurst against the decision of Cotswold District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/00936/FUL, dated 8 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is single storey extension at the rear of existing two storey non-designated cottage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension at the rear of existing two storey non-designated cottage at Priory Cottage, Climperwell Road, Brimpsfield GL4 8LD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/00936/FUL, dated 8 March 2021, subject to the conditions below:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Plan scale 1:1250, Site Plan Drawing No. JT-A/10- 22, Proposed Plans JT-A/10 – 23, Existing Elevations JT-A/12 – 2, Existing and Proposed Elevations with Boundary Wall Drawing No. JT-A/12-11, Proposed Elevations Drawing No. JT-A/12-11; and Existing Plans Drawing No. JT-A/10-19.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the application form. Although different to that on the decision notice no confirmation that the change was agreed has been provided.

Main Issue

3. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, having particular regard to the Brimpsfield Conservation Area (CA) and the heritage significance of Priory Cottage.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located within the CA. As such, I have had regard to the duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing its character or appearance. Planning Practice Guidance defines a non-designated heritage asset as having a degree of heritage significance meriting consideration in planning decisions and indicates that local planning authorities may identify non-designated heritage assets as part of the decision-making process on planning applications¹, as has been done in this instance.
5. The significance of the CA lies, in part, in the traditional form and materials of many of the older properties that generally follow a ribbon pattern along the winding roads lined with stone front boundary walls and hedgerows. There are frequent views between buildings of the surrounding fields and the rural setting of the settlement. Nevertheless, there is variety in the built form in the CA and surrounding area with buildings of differing appearance and size, including residential and agricultural styles that are often seen with each other.
6. Priory Cottage reflects many of the characteristics of the CA, despite having been previously altered and extended. The significance of it also lies in its traditional appearance with the front elevation proportions, materials and stone boundary walls having been retained, along with its location among the undeveloped fields and open landscape beyond it. Therefore, it is a non-designated heritage asset and currently contributes positively to the significance of the CA.
7. The proposed extension would have a large footprint, comparable to that of the existing property and given the curve of the road would be visible on the approach to Brimpsfield. However, space would remain between the extension and the nearest buildings, allowing views over and around it. The neighbouring buildings and existing property would screen the extension in many views along the road. Where it would be seen, views of the extension would be in the context of the adjacent buildings.
8. The proposal would be considerably lower than the existing property and clearly subordinate to it. It would have matching materials unlike the existing shed that would be removed. There would be limited alterations to the existing dwelling with its form, proportions and evolution being apparent. Although L shaped, the extension would be of a simplistic style with similarly pitched roofs. As such, it would not compete with the original property.
9. The proportions and scale of the extension draws on an agricultural style that reflects the numerous examples of single storey buildings and additions of a not dissimilar scale in the village, some of which were closer to the road and more prominent in the streetscene. Therefore, the extension would not appear discordant in its immediate context or that of the wider settlement.
10. Views of the site from the nearby public rights of way and St Michael and All Angels Church and its grounds already have the backdrop of the buildings at Priory Farm and outbuildings at the appeal site. Unlike to the other side of the dwelling where there is greater separation to the nearest built form, the appeal site appears as part of a cluster with Priory Farm in many views.

¹ Paragraph: 039 Reference ID: 18a-039-20190723 and Paragraph: 040 Reference ID: 18a-040-20190723

11. The sloping land, boundary treatments, vegetation and the distance between there and the site, mean the proposal would not be a prominent feature. The church setting, and that of the SAM² where there is even more distance and intervening features, which includes the surrounding fields, wooded areas and built form further beyond would not be harmed. Given the above the scheme would also conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
12. Consequently, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area, including the significance of the CA and of Priory Cottage as a non-designated heritage asset. The scheme would accord with the design and heritage protection aims of Policies EN2, EN10, EN11, EN12, and the Cotswold Design Code of the Cotswold District Local Plan, as well as the historic environment policies contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Other Matters

13. From the evidence before me previous applications at the site were not of the same scale and/or layout. Therefore, they are materially different to the scheme before me which I have dealt with on its own individual merits.

Conditions

14. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed one requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interest of certainty. To protect the character and appearance of the area a condition regarding the external materials is imposed.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given, and having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, subject to the conditions above.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR

² Scheduled Ancient Monument of Brimpsfield Castle