



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 August 2023

by E Pickernell BSc MSC MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29.09.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F1610/D/23/3316685

Wykum, High Street, Mickleton, Gloucestershire GL55 6SL

- 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 Keith Phelpstead against the decision of Cotswold District Council.
 - The application Ref 22/01168/FUL, dated 30 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 22 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is demolition of existing garage and creation of parking area for 2 cars.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the Mickleton Conservation Area (CA) with particular regard to the impact on the significance of non-designated heritage assets.

Reasons

3. The appeal site includes a two-storey dwelling which fronts Mickleton High Street and an existing garage located at the rear of the plot. A footpath to the side of the property leads to the garage which is also accessed from a shared gravelled drive from a lane to the rear.
4. The site is located within the Mickleton CA. I therefore have a statutory duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the area.
5. The CA comprises the historic core of the settlement and open, green areas to the west. The CA is characterised by a variety of building types of different scales including grand, detached dwellings, more modest cottages and outbuildings. The use of Cotswold Stone is a unifying feature of the area, although the use of brick and render is also common. Roofs also exhibit considerable variety including clay tiles, slates and thatch. The irregular, historic street pattern and building layout adds to the interest of the CA.
6. The garage is visible from a number of vantage points within the CA including from the footpath which borders the appeal site to the north and from the lane and shared drive to the rear. Its roof is also visible from Granbrook Lane (B4632) to the north, to the side of White Cottage. The traditional form of the building including its steeply pitched roof of clay tiles and walls of Cotswold

limestone with red brick sections, make it typical of the area. Its location at the rear of the plot contributes towards a sense of enclosure to the appeal site and it gives a presence and visual interest to the rear driveway area. Therefore, despite its non-original garage door, and the fact that it has been altered over the years, it makes a positive contribution to the CA.

7. The proposal would involve the demolition of most of the building, albeit the side wall, fronting the footpath would be retained and some of the stone reused to form a new gate pier. As a consequence, the presence and form of the building in this location would be substantially lost. The views of the building from vantage points on the lane to the rear and from Granbrook Lane would be altered and the removal of the majority of the building from these would reduce their interest. Furthermore, despite the proposed gates, the proposal would result in a reduction in the sense of enclosure to the rear of the existing dwelling and the replacement hardstanding would have a harsh, urbanising effect on this part of the CA. As such the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA.
8. As required by para 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset, irrespective of the amount of harm identified. In this case the proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA. Paragraph 202 of the Framework states that if a development would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, then this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
9. The appellant contends that the garage is not suitable for parking a modern vehicle and that the proposal would result in improvements to highway safety through an increase in parking spaces which would reduce parking on the High Street and the provision of a turning area which would eliminate the necessity to reverse down the drive. However, I have been provided with no substantive evidence that any on-street parking or reversing manoeuvres which currently occur, result in an unacceptable risk to highway safety. I also note that the appellant would install an electric vehicle charging point to facilitate the use of an electric car as part of the proposal which, given the small-scale nature of the development, is a minor public benefit. Overall, I attach limited weight to the public benefits of the proposal. Given the great weight that must be attached to the conservation of heritage assets, I conclude that the public benefits of the proposal do not outweigh the harm.
10. The existing dwelling (Wykum) is a non-designated heritage asset. Paragraph 203 of the Framework requires that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application.
11. The significance of Wykum lies in its traditional architecture and materials, and its position at the back edge of the pavement, giving it a close connection with the High Street. The proposal would not directly affect Wykum as it does not alter the building itself, however it would result in a reduction in the sense of enclosure to the rear of the plot and the substantial loss of a traditional building with which it is closely associated. Therefore, the proposal would result in harm to the setting of Wykum and consequently, its significance.
12. I conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the Mickleton CA with particular regard to the significance of

Wykum which is a non-designated heritage asset. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies EN2, EN10, EN11 and EN12 of the Cotswold District Local Plan 2011 – 2031 (Adopted August 2018) which collectively seek to ensure, amongst other things, that development protects the historic environment, including designated and non-designated heritage assets.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan and the Framework, and that there are no material considerations that would outweigh that conflict. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

E Pickernell

INSPECTOR