



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2023 by R Parker BSc (Hons)

Decision by S Edwards BA MA MATCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11th June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/23/3324216

Rock Cottage, Rockness Hill, Nailsworth, Gloucestershire GL6 0JT

- 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 David and Emma Martin against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref is S.23/0245/HHOLD.
 - The development proposed is described as "proposed single-storey side extension to provide additional living accommodation".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. In December 2023 the Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). While 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 this course of action.
4. The appeal scheme lies within what was previously known as the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). On 22 November 2023 all designated AONBs in England and Wales were renamed National Landscapes. In this recommendation, I shall therefore refer to the Cotswolds National Landscape.

Main Issue

5. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The appeal site lies within a rural area, which is varied in character and appearance. Nearby are several detached properties appropriately positioned in large plots, as well as semi-detached and terraced dwellings. The appeal property is a broad-fronted, two-storey detached stone dwelling set in a reasonably large linear plot. It is, at heart, historic, and its original, symmetrical form remains discernible.
7. The property has previously been extended to the side and rear. There is also an extant planning permission (Local Planning Authority Reference: S.21/2727/HHOLD) for a scheme comprising a side extension at the opposite end of the property, as well as an enlargement of the existing detached garage. Whether or not the building work taking place at the time of the site visit was related to the construction of this extension, I have no reason to doubt that this permission will be fully implemented.
8. The appeal proposal is for a further extension adjoining the existing side extension. The appellants have sought to overcome the concerns raised by the Council as part of a previous, similar application (Local Planning Authority Reference: S.23/0245/HHOLD). In this proposal, the new addition would be set back from the front elevation and down from the ridge of the existing side extension to appear subservient.
9. The proposed extension would in itself be modest in scale and be built using sympathetic materials. However, it would lead to an accumulation of additions which would be substantial in the context of the host building and appear disproportionate to the scale of the original property. The cumulative impact of the proposed extension, together with previously approved additions, would as a result unbalance and have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property. Although the extension would be set against the bank and mature landscaping, this would not mitigate for the harm caused by the proposed addition, which would be clearly visible within the street scene and be detrimental to the surrounding area.
10. I have had regard to the arguments put forward by the appellants, who want to secure the viable use of the building as a future-proof dwelling with a home office. However, these are private circumstances to which I can only ascribe very limited weight. Moreover, and having regard to the available evidence, I have no reason to believe that the continued occupation of the appeal property is dependent on the construction of the proposed extension.
11. Given the above, the appeal scheme would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It therefore conflicts with Policies HC8 (2) and CP14 (5) of the Stroud District Local Plan (Adopted November 2015), which notably require extensions to be of an appropriate design and appearance, but also in keeping with the scale and character of the original dwelling (taking into account any cumulative additions), including their heritage and surroundings.

Other Matters

12. The Council has not raised any concerns regarding the impact of the proposal on the Cotswolds National Landscape, and I see no reason to disagree. The site is within the built envelope of the village and the proposed extension would not

stand out within the landscape. Therefore, the proposal would conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the Cotswolds National Landscape.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. There are no material reasons indicating that the appeal scheme should be determined other than in accordance 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.

R Parker

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's recommendation and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

S Edwards

INSPECTOR