



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 July 2024

by Eleni Randle BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/24/3346644

The Glen, High Street, Arlingham, Gloucestershire, GL2 7JN

- 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 Jack Hazelwood against Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref is S.24/0622/HHOLD.
 - The development proposed is erection of rear two storey extension, proposed canopy over front door and proposed solar panels.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have utilised the Council's description of the development as per the decision notice as I feel it more concisely describes the development.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the impact of the proposal upon i) the character and appearance of the original dwelling and the site's wider setting ii) the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a residential property which fronts the High Street and is of brick and clay tiled roof construction with extensions to the rear which are acknowledged to have a mix of differing roofing materials ranging from slate to a flat roof as noted within the submissions before me. They are, however, not of note within views of the site and allow clear views through and towards Mayfield House to the south. The appeal site stands within the Arlingham Conservation Area (CA) with Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservations Areas) Act 1990 requiring that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving and enhancing the character and appearance of the CA. There are several elements to the appeal proposal with the refusal reasons being specifically attributable to the erection of a rear two storey extension. This appeal will, therefore, focus upon that element against the two main issues outlined above.

Character and appearance of the original dwelling and the site's wider setting

5. The proposal would result in replacement of two small single-storey extensions with one large two storey rear extension that would project into the garden area. I consider the two-storey rear extension, as submitted, to be overly large and of a bulk, scale and massing which would not appear as a subservient

addition to the host dwelling itself. The extension would result in an uneven double gable with a roof height which would decrease as it extends to the rear as well as resulting in shallow roof pitches which are inconsistent with the existing roof slopes and fenestration inconsistent with the character of the host dwelling. The eave height of the proposed extension would also exceed the existing eave height and would appear awkward in design but also contribute to visual dominance, compared to the host dwelling.

6. It is stated, by the appellant, that the eaves are higher to allow for the headroom as the rear part of the property has a considerable step up to its floor level and that this also would allow for windows to be utilised as a fire escape as required by building regulations. If the eaves were to be lowered, it is stated that the window would be lost or that there would be a need to create a dormer in order to accommodate a fire escape window. Whilst the eaves height is not specifically discussed, within the Council's assessment, the size, scale, massing and detailing of the proposal was considered to be overly large and at odds with the simple form of the host dwelling. I find the proposal, including the eave height exceeding that of the existing eaves, would not be legible as a subservient addition and that whilst there may be a step down, from the ridge, in the region of 200mm this is insufficient to prevent the proposal presenting as a dominant rear projection when considered in the context of the host dwelling itself as well as its setting.
7. Overall, the proposals, as they are before me, I find would dominate the host dwelling in terms of both character and appearance resulting in an awkward interaction between the host dwelling's roof and the proposal. By virtue of its design, form and detailing, as well as scale and massing the proposed two storey rear extension would result in a feature which would not extend the host dwelling in a harmonious manner and would not be legible as a subservient addition. The proposal would be out of keeping with the host dwelling impacting, harmfully, to both the character and appearance of the host dwelling itself.
8. The proposal would be contrary to Stroud District Local Plan 2015 (LP) Policy HC8(2) which requires the height, scale, form and design of extensions to be in keeping with the scale and character of the original dwelling and the site's wider setting and location as well as LP Policy CP14(5) which requires development to be of an appropriate design and appearance which is respectful of the surroundings, including the local topography, built environment and heritage.

Conservation Area

9. At the time of my site visit, I found that the proposal would be readily visible in views within the CA when approaching from the north due to the set back of the adjacent building which is labelled, within the appellant's submissions, as a hall. The appellant's submission shows, shaded blue, potential viewpoints of the proposal within the context of the High Street which I would agree with based upon my site visit. I found, from my site visit, that due to the appeal site being forward of the building line of Glendale, to the north, this further exacerbates visibility as well as providing clear views of the property to the south (Mayfield House) which currently provides visual interest within the CA.
10. The bulk, scale, and massing would largely obscure views of Mayfield House which would cause harm to the character and appearance of the street scene

leaving only the top of the ridge visible as demonstrated by the 3D imagery submitted by the appellant. It should be kept in mind that character, and appearance, are separate matters with appearance being the outward, visible, qualities, whereas character is the sum of all qualities which distinguish an area. I find that the views of Mayfield House contribute to both the character, and appearance, of the CA which be lost as a result of the proposal as submitted. As a result of the proposed bulk, scale, and massing, the proposal's visual prominence within the street scene and obstruction of views of adjacent Mayfield House, I find the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the CA as a designated heritage asset

11. The National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (the Framework) states, in paragraph 205, that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the assets conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. In accordance with the Framework, paragraph 208, where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. The proposal is for alterations to a single residential dwelling which would result in entirely private benefits, and I have no evidence before me within this appeal to support that the proposal would result in any public benefits to outweigh the weight which should be given to the less than substantial harm which has been identified.
12. The proposal would be contrary to LP Policy ES10 which seeks to support proposals and initiatives which conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the heritage significance and settings of the district's heritage assets and, in this case, I find that the proposal would be visually prominent within the street scene, obstructing views and in a manner which would cause less than substantial harm to both the character and appearance of the CA with no public benefits to outweigh the great weight which should be given to the harm identified.
13. I note that reference has been made to other sites, stated to benefit from a double gable design. These are listed within both the Design and Access Statement and Appeal Statement accompanied by an aerial image labelled as such. Each case should be considered on its own merits and based upon the evidence before me, it would appear that double gable extensions are not in principle, uncharacteristic for the locality. This may, therefore, support the principle of this type of extension but this is subject to compliance with other Local Plan policies as well as the proposals interaction with the host dwelling itself as to acceptability.
14. In the case that is before me, it would appear, that the setting of the appeal site is relatively unique compared to the other examples which have been provided due to its location and surrounding built form with views of, or through, the sites in question being generally more limited. I do not, however, have copies of the relevant planning permissions and/or plans of the examples provided to understand the reasoning for any permission granted as well as, in relation to the main issue, the proposals interaction with the original dwelling prior to construction of the double gable extensions noted. I also note what the appellant considers to be the best, and most prominent, example of

Glendale, which is to the north of the application site, the other side of the adjacent hall.

15. Whilst Glendale is set back, and not immediately fronting the pavement, I note there are some similarities as to general setting and can see, from the Google image provided by the appellant within their statement that there were views through the site over the south elevation but that these were not, in comparison to the appeal site, of an adjacent property adding interest to the CA. Despite this, from the limited information which is before me, I find that the proposed rear extension stated to have been granted planning permission in 2009 at Glendale appears proportionate in depth and most notably is respectful of, and continues, the original eave height of the host dwelling to a roof pitch more similarly matched. I find that results in a more sympathetic extension in keeping with both the character and appearance of the host dwelling which I do not find is the case as a result of the proposals, bulk, scale massing and design as is before me.

Other Matters

16. I note that comments in support of the proposal have been raised. I have acknowledged, in the main issues above, the examples extensions within the locality as well as having taken the case which is before me based upon its own merits. I do not find, for the reasons set out above, that the proposal would minimally block/obscure views of Mayfield House given the submissions which clearly demonstrate the proposal would remove all views with the exception of the top of the ridge.
17. It is outlined the images on Google Earth are out of date, however, I have considered the proposals based upon the submissions that are before me as well as what I have seen as part of my visit to the site in person. Renovation of any property is, evidently, positive, however, for the reasons set out above I found the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the CA which means that it must be balanced against the public benefits of the proposal, and none have been progressed. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation in accordance with the Framework.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons outlined above, and taking account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Eleni Randle

INSPECTOR