
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2023

by Rebecca McAndrew, BA Hons, MSc, PG Dip Urban Design, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/F1610/D/23/3326600

1 The Knoll, Kempford, Gloucestershire GL7 4NN

- 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 Benjamin Gamsa against the decision of Cotswold District Council.
 - The application Ref 23/00832/FUL, dated 9 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 2 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey extension to the dwelling with attached two bay car port and a single storey extension to an existing garage / garden store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a two-storey extension to the dwelling with attached two bay car port and a single storey extension to an existing garage / garden store at 1 The Knoll, Kempford, Gloucestershire GL7 4NN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 23/00832/FUL, dated 9 March 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 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 approved plans: 1990.002 V02, 1990.301 V02 and 1990.502 V04
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan, Reference AJA180, dated 23 March 2023.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the Council's standard precautionary working method statement, in so far as it relates to reptiles, 'Public Biodiversity Specification #1 – Precautionary method of working for reptiles, common toads, hedgehogs, badgers and nesting birds'.
 - 5) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing buildings.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the impact on the character and appearance of the site and area.

Reasons

3. Policy EN2 of the Cotswold District Local Plan 2011-2031 (2018) (CDLP) promotes good quality design which respects the character of the original property. It requires proposals to accord with the Cotswold Design Code, which forms Appendix D of the CDLP. This advises against extensions with excessive bulk which dominate the host dwelling and surroundings. It states that extensions 'should generally be subservient to the height, area and overall mass of the original building'.
4. The proposed extension, combined with the carport, would form a large structure which would sit to the side of the host dwelling and would also project significantly forward of the principal elevation. The external materials and pitched roof form of the proposals would respond to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. In addition, given that there is no set building line, the projection would not undermine an existing development pattern. Whilst the proposal would not appear as subservient to the appellant's home, it would add interest to the property.
5. I observed on my site visit that the extended house would reflect the 'L' shaped form of other homes in the immediate area. I recognise that those forward projections form part of the original design, and some appear as subservient to those properties. However, as I have described, the proposed extension would respond to the context of the host dwelling and would not appear incongruous. Consequently, in this instance, I consider this to be an acceptable design approach.
6. Whilst I also acknowledge the Council's concerns that the forward-facing elevation of the extension would not include any window openings, the proposed carport would add interest to an otherwise blank elevation. I also note comments regarding alterations to the fenestration of the host dwelling. Nevertheless, in my opinion, this would not undermine the character and appearance of the proposals.
7. Taking all this into account, the proposed extension would sit comfortably within the context of the main dwelling and area. As such, it would not harm the character and appearance of the dwelling and area and is therefore acceptable.
8. Turning to the proposed extension to the garage in the appellant's rear garden, would be an elongation of the existing building. It would clearly give rise to a notably long structure. However, given that it is a single storey building of a simple form, it would not appear at odds with the character and appearance of the existing garage, main dwelling or area. Additionally, it would be well-screened by the boundary wall which runs around the property and various vegetation. On this basis, the proposed garage extension would not unduly harm the character and appearance of the site or area.

9. In conclusion, overall the proposals would not unduly harm the character and appearance of the existing house, garage or area. As such, there is no conflict with Policy EN2 of the CDLP.

Conditions

10. I impose conditions in regard to timescales and setting out the approved plans to provide certainty. I attach conditions regarding external materials and tree protection to safeguard the character and appearance of the site. I attach a condition relating to a precautionary method of working in respect of reptiles in order to reduce the risk of impacting great crested newts.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons outlined above, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR