



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 October 2023 by Max Webb BA(Hons) MSc

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 December 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/23/3323583

Knoll Cottage, Upton Hill, Upton St. Leonards, Gloucestershire GL4 8DB

- 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 David Brooks against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref S.23/0380/HHOLD, dated 22 February 2023, was refused by notice dated 5 May 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as “alteration and extension to property”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) on 19 December 2023. Whilst I have had regard to the revised national policy as a material consideration, planning decisions must still be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this instance, the issues most relevant to the appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party would be disadvantaged by such a course of action.
4. On 22 November 2023, all designated Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) in England and Wales became “National Landscapes” (NLs). I have therefore made reference to NLs in my recommendation and specifically referred to the Cotswolds AONB as the Cotswolds National Landscape (CNL). However, for the avoidance of doubt, the legal designation and policy status of these areas are unchanged and I have proceeded on this basis.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal property consists of an attractive traditional cottage and previous extensions. The original cottage and a previous extension to the side feature

traditional roof forms. A lean-to extension to the rear features a sloping roof, projecting beyond the original cottage on one side.

7. The proposed two-storey extension would be large and would add significant bulk to the rear of the dwelling. The combined size of extensions would lead to them overwhelming the original cottage and the height and size of this proposal would also dominate the existing dwelling as a whole. Whilst the resulting size of the property would not be overly large in terms of the surrounding area, the scale and form of the proposal would not be in keeping with the scale and character of the host dwelling. The use of matching render may blend the extension with the dwelling in terms of material, however it would not mitigate the effect of the scale of the proposal, which would remain an overly large addition that would harm the character of the property.
8. The roof form proposed would retain the projection beyond the traditional roof on one side with the ridge at the same height as the main dwelling, which would not relate well to the form of the host dwelling. On the opposite side, the proposed roof form would result in a particularly high eaves height, leaving a large, blank wall and little visible pitched roof. This would dominate the host property.
9. From the rear the extent of flat roof would not be easily appreciated due to the angle of view, however the 'dummy' pitch would be very small in proportion to the wall, creating an awkward relationship with the main property and a poor appearance. There are other flat-roofed elements on properties in the surrounding area and a flat-roofed element may be possible on the appeal dwelling. However, for the reasons above, the specific roof form proposed would cause harm to the character of the host dwelling.
10. Whilst the existing lean-to extension may not relate well to the original cottage, adding further bulk and creating a roof form which relates poorly to the host dwelling means the proposed extension would cause additional harm, rather than enhancing the character of the property.
11. Parts of the proposal would not be visible from the street scene and as such would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Nevertheless, this does not alter the harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling itself, so does not weigh in favour of the development.
12. Overall, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling. It would therefore conflict with Policy HC8(2) of the Stroud District Local Plan (2015), which permits development where the height, scale, form and design of an extension is in keeping with the scale and character of the original dwelling.

Other Matters

13. The proposal would improve energy efficiency as required by Policy HC8(4) and would provide additional living space for the appellant's family. However, it has not been demonstrated that these benefits could not also be achieved through a proposal that does not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Restorative improvements to the original cottage could be achieved separately from the appeal proposal. I therefore give these matters limited weight, and they would not outweigh the harm identified.

14. The Council has not suggested that the proposal would result in harm to the landscape or scenic beauty of the CNL. Due to the location and residential nature of the proposal, I also do not find harm to the CNL. The proposal would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. These are, however, neutral matters in the planning balance so do not outweigh the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Conclusion and Recommendation

15. The proposal would conflict with the Local Plan and national policy, and there are no material considerations that justify granting planning permission in conflict with the development plan. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Max Webb

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and agree with the reasoning and conclusion set out above. On that basis the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR