



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 January 2022

by Oliver Marigold BSc DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/21/3286557

2 Bridge Road, Frampton on Severn, GL2 7HA

- 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 Mike Barrett against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref S.21/1432/HHOLD, dated 4 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is construction of dormer window/room in rear main roof slope to create additional second floor accommodation comprising bedroom and en-suite bathroom. Construction of timber (oak) and glazed single storey conservatory to rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling and surrounding area, including any effect on the Frampton on Severn Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a semi-detached gable fronted house, fronting on to Bridge Road. The property is within the Frampton on Severn Conservation Area (the CA). The CA is set around Frampton on Severn's large Village Green, but also includes other areas of housing such as The Oval, behind the appeal site. One design feature of properties hereabouts is their strong roof gable features, which contribute to the area's appearance.
4. Number 2 Bridge Road and its immediate neighbours are modern properties which share a similar design with each other, incorporating roof gables and half-gables to the front and rear. The appeal property's design therefore reflects that of its surroundings, and makes a modest but positive contribution to the area's character and appearance, including that of the CA.
5. The Council does not object to the proposed conservatory or front rooflights. Given their form and scale, I agree that they would be in keeping with the design of the dwelling.
6. The proposed dormer however would be large and bulky, covering much of the width and depth of the rear roof slope. It would introduce a horizontal feature at odds with the vertical nature of the host dwelling. Its size and scale would result in a top-heavy appearance, which would compete with and detract from

the rear half-gable feature. Its design would therefore significantly harm the character and appearance of the dwelling.

7. At my visit I saw that the dormer would not be noticeable from Bridge Road itself but could be seen from The Oval. Given its visibility, I consider that the dormer would similarly harm the character and appearance of the wider area.
8. The site is within the CA and Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that I pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the CA's character and appearance. I recognise that the Council and its Conservation Officer did not initially object to the dormer in CA terms, but in light of my findings on the impact to the area's character and appearance, including to views within the CA, I sought comments from both parties on the impact on the CA too, particularly from The Oval.
9. The appellant has drawn my attention to the nearby dwelling known as Rochester, facing Frampton Green, which has a dormer said to have been recently consented and installed. I saw this property on my visit, but the design and form of the dwelling and its dormer is significantly different from the appeal proposal, particularly in terms of its scale within the roofscape.
10. The development at Loweswater, directly opposite the appeal site, has also been highlighted as having a similar impact to the proposal. While these properties have large front two storey extensions, and are visible from Bridge Road, their overall design is very different from the appeal dwelling, limiting comparison between the schemes. In any case I have dealt with the appeal proposal on its own merits.
11. Given the harm to the character and appearance of the area referred to above, I find that the proposal would also harm the CA. The statutory duty referred to above is a matter of considerable importance and weight. The appeal proposal would have a negative effect on the significance of a designated heritage asset and would result in 'less than substantial' harm in the words of the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework').
12. I do not doubt the appellants' need for more family accommodation, nor the effect that dismissal would have on their desire to remain in the village given that the previous proposal is not now possible. I also recognise the support from the Parish Council and others; the discussions said to have taken place with the District Council prior to its decision, and that no other areas of concern were raised. These factors do not however constitute wider public benefits that can be weighed against the harm identified.
13. Therefore, in light of the harm to the character and appearance of the area and CA as a whole, the proposal would be contrary to policies HC8 and CP14 of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan 2015, as well as the Framework, all of which require that a development's form and design is appropriate and in keeping with the scale and character of the dwelling and its surroundings. For the same reasons, it would also conflict with policy ES10 which states that the historic environment should be preserved or enhanced.
14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Oliver Marigold INSPECTOR