
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 May 2023

by Michael J Muston BA(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 June 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/23/3314758

Walnut Tree Cottage, Nupend, Stonehouse GL10 3SP

- 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 and Mrs P and J Spencer-Phillips against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref S.22/2328/HHOLD, dated 24 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side and single storey rear extension to provide garage and bedroom.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in the village of Nupend. Whilst a large residential development is taking place close by, the village maintains a distinctive character, enhanced by a predominance of older properties of traditional appearance. The appeal property, when seen from Nupend Lane, appears of simple design and contributes positively to the character of the area.
4. The proposal involves adding a large two storey extension to the existing dwelling, which would add very significantly to the width of the house. It would be set down from the existing roof, and set back from the existing front elevation. However, this set down and set back would be so small that they would do little to ameliorate the apparent substantial increase in the mass of Walnut Tree Cottage, when seen from Nupend Lane.
5. The adverse impact of the proposed extension on the street scene would be exacerbated by the design of the proposed front elevation. The porch would appear as overly large and dominant, the first floor windows would fail to align in height or depth with those in the existing house, and the ground floor to the south of the porch, featuring only a garage door of utilitarian appearance and a small window, would lack interest.

6. Overall, the proposed development would appear at odds with the house to which it would be attached. This, when combined with the proposed extension's scale, and the way it would be attached to the main house, would have a significantly adverse effect on the character of Walnut Tree Cottage, and its contribution to the character and appearance of the wider area. This would particularly be the case when seen from Nupend Lane, but also to a lesser extent from the public right of way to the south-west of the site.
7. The appellants have pointed out that this application was refused for the same reasons as those used to refuse a previous application (S.21/2137/HHOLD), despite having been amended since that refusal. However, the fact that a scheme has been amended, in an attempt to overcome a reason for refusal, does not necessarily mean that this will have been successful. In my opinion, the current proposal remains unacceptable for the reasons stated by the Council.
8. I conclude that the development would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies HC8 and CP14 of the Stroud District Local Plan (2015). These policies seek, amongst other things, extensions whose height, scale, form and design are in keeping with the scale and character of the original dwelling, and development of an appropriate design and appearance, respectful of its surroundings.

Other Matters

9. A number of listed buildings are located in the vicinity of the appeal site. The Council do not allege that the proposal would harm the setting of any of these listed buildings. The character and appearance of the area around the appeal site is undeniably enhanced by them, and I have found that the proposed development would cause harm to that. However, I agree with the Council that this does not amount to harm to the individual setting of any of those listed buildings, nor that it would unacceptably impact on their significance.

Conclusion

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

Michael J Muston

INSPECTOR