



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 December 2024

by **B J Sims BSc (Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/24/3348558

Little Green, Bridge Road, Frampton-on-Severn, Gloucestershire, GL2 7HB.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Jewell against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/0198/HHOLD.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a home office and WC above an existing detached garage-workshop.
-

Decision

The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of a home office and WC above an existing detached garage-workshop at Little Green, Bridge Road, Frampton-on-Severn, Gloucestershire, GL2 7HB, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/0198/HHOLD, and subject to the following conditions:

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in all respects in strict accordance with the plans listed below:

Location Plan – Drawing No. 543445-24-10
Proposed Site Plan – Drawing No. 543445-24-5
Proposed Ground Floor Plan – Drawing No. 543445-24-6
Proposed First Floor Plan – Drawing No. 543445-24-7
Proposed Elevations – Drawing No. 543445-24-9
Proposed Roof Plan – Drawing No. 543445-24-8
- 3) The garage-workshop-office building created by the development hereby approved shall be used only ancillary to the domestic dwelling of Little Green and shall not be further altered or extended in any way and the double garage shall be kept available for domestic garage used related to Little Green unless otherwise approved by the local planning authority.

Procedural Matter

1. The Appellants criticise the handling of the application and alleged failure of the Council to engage in pre-application discussions, citing lack of resources. These matters may remain between the parties but do not concern the appeal, which is

determined on a fresh and independent assessment of every factor for and against the proposed development.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:

- i. the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing garage-workshop building and its relationship to the dwelling house once altered as proposed; and
- ii. the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Frampton-on-Severn CA.

Reasons

Character, Appearance and Relationship to Dwelling

3. The appeal proposal seeks to create a first-floor home office, meeting room and WC above an existing, brick-built, pitch-roofed double-garage-workshop, situated at the side of the front forecourt of Little Green. The stated purpose of the development is to provide dedicated office space for the duties of the Appellants as local farm directors.
4. Little Green itself is a modern, detached, brick-built bungalow, with a prominent, rendered front-facing gable rising almost to the main ridge.
5. The proposed office, meeting room and WC would be reached via an external timber staircase against the rear gable wall of the garage building.
6. To create sufficient headroom and light, the eaves and ridge of the building would be raised by 0.6m and a mono-pitch dormer and one rooflight would be installed on each roof slope. The dormer cheeks would be rendered to match the front gable of the bungalow. The ground floor, overall roof profile, and external materials of the garage building would otherwise remain unchanged. I find nothing objectionable in the architectural design of the proposed alterations in terms of its appearance.
7. The increased overall height would raise the roof of the garage building almost to the level of the main ridge of the bungalow, reducing the degree to which the outbuilding is properly subservient to the dwelling.
8. The Appellants refer to several other cases of similar development above domestic garages but, in the examples cited, the outbuildings are plainly subservient to their related dwellings in scale and separation. In the present case, the outbuilding is already much closer than these to its host, in both size, height and siting and, in any event, is to be assessed on individual merit.
9. Taking account of the architectural consistency between the two buildings, I consider overall that, the building, with its prominent double garage doors and smaller footprint, would still remain visibly subsidiary and ancillary to the dwelling as an outbuilding, even after the alterations now proposed.
10. There is an implication that the use of the home office, with its relatively spacious meeting room, could include activity more commercial than domestic in nature. However, home working is now commonplace and, with the ground floor of the building remaining as a garage-workshop serving the dwelling, I find overall that the

relationship of the outbuilding to the dwelling would continue to be acceptable and that the proposed development would harm neither the character nor the appearance of the garage building nor the property as a whole.

Frampton-on-Severn Conservation Area

11. There remains the issue of whether the proposed development would affect the Frampton-on-Severn CA.
12. The first question is whether the appeal site is within the CA, as maintained by the Council, or outside it, as asserted by Appellants. The parties submitted conflicting plans in this regard and the Council failed to resolve the matter in correspondence.
13. Plainly, this kind of confusion is bad for planning and cannot be condoned. Be that as it may, strictly for the purpose of deciding this appeal, I give the benefit of the doubt to the Council.
14. Even accepting that the appeal property is within the CA, it is only just inside its northern boundary. Moreover, the property is relatively isolated and secluded, being well separated from other properties in the CA and largely screened by trees.
15. I have already found above that the proposed development would not harm the character or appearance of Little Green. It accordingly follows that the intended alterations to the garage-workshop there, would not cause any harm either to the character or appearance of the Frampton-on-Severn CA as a whole, or indeed to its setting if, in the alternative, the Council were to accept that it lies just outside the CA boundary. The character and appearance of the CA would thus be preserved in the terms of established planning law.

Planning Conditions

16. The Council suggest without prejudice only standard conditions stating time for commencement and requiring compliance with approved plans. A suggested condition to ensure that the office and meeting room and the appeal building, as a whole, remain truly ancillary to the host dwelling is not suggested by either party. However, it is entirely clear from the written evidence that it is the intention of the Appellants that this should be so. It is my own view that such a condition is needed, preventing any further alteration to the use or appearance of the building.

Conclusions

17. For the foregoing reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would accord with Policy HC8 of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan (SDLP) and particularly its criterion 2, in that the height, scale, form and design of the alterations to the garage building would be in keeping with the scale and character of the dwelling and the site's wider setting and location. The development would also comply with Policy CP14(5), requiring an appropriate design and appearance, which is respectful of the surroundings, including local heritage and the environment. Equally, there would be no conflict with Policy ES10, which protects the Frampton-on-Severn CA as a designated heritage asset. These policies are essentially consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework.
18. There is nothing in the written representations to indicate any other planning objection to the appeal, such as with regard to amenity, parking or highway safety.

19. I conclude overall that the proposed development would be compliant with the development plan as a whole and that the appeal should be allowed and the permission sought granted, subject to the conditions I have described.

B J Sims

INSPECTOR