



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2024 by N Manley BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by S Edwards BA MATCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/24/3345107

10 The Knoll, South Street, Uley, Gloucestershire GL11 5SR

- 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 Joe Coggins against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref is S.24/0181/HHOLD.
 - The development proposed is described as "demolish existing front extension and form new single storey front extension."
-

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 site lies within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), which is designated for the purposes of conserving and enhancing natural beauty. On 22 November 2023, all designated AONBs in England and Wales became 'National Landscapes' (NLs). In my recommendation I shall therefore refer to the Cotswolds AONB as the Cotswolds NL.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the pair of semi-detached dwellings to which it belongs.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. 10 The Knoll (no 10) is a two-storey semi-detached property located on the northern side of a quiet residential road. The adjoining semi-detached property to the west has a broadly similar design and appearance, with both properties sharing similar features, mimicking each other with regard to the positioning of fenestration and the presence of a central porch. Although there are differences in window colour and design, as well as in the materials and minor design variations in the style of the central porch, this does not detract from the largely uniform appearance of this pair of semi-detached properties.
6. Furthermore, both properties are set back from the highway with generous front gardens, giving the pair a balanced and largely consistent size and design. In contrast, the properties to the east and west of the semi-detached pair are larger detached homes, positioned slightly forward of the building line

of no 10. Both these detached homes feature dormer windows to the front, with the property to the east also displaying a front gable that projects significantly forward. Although there is a residential bungalow to the south of the appeal site, the topography of the area affords views across the open countryside and Cotswolds NL.

7. The proposed off-centre, front-projecting extension would substantially increase the depth, scale, and bulk of no 10. Compared to the existing shared façade of no 10 with its adjoining semi-detached neighbour, this alteration would disrupt the uniform character of the pair, appearing as an incongruous feature and resulting in a visually dominant addition that would unbalance the shared front elevation. The removal of the existing central porch, a feature present on both properties, would further exacerbate this disruption, causing overall visual harm to the character and appearance of the semi-detached pair and the appeal property.
8. The appellant has suggested that there are varying rooflines nearby, along with no consistent building line. While the detached properties on either side do not share the same building line and have different rooflines, no 10 and its adjoining semi-detached neighbour inherently share a consistent building line and similar roofline. This uniformity stands out as a defining feature amid the surrounding variations and would be harmed as a result of the development.
9. Given the above, I therefore conclude the proposed development would have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the pair of semi-detached dwellings it forms part of. It would therefore conflict with Policy HC8 Criterion 2 of the Stroud Local Plan (adopted 2015) which notably requires the scale, form and design of an extension to be in keeping with the scale and character of the original dwelling, but also respect the appearance of the site and local area.

Other Matters

10. The appeal site lies within the Cotswolds NL. However, no harm to the Cotswold NL has been identified by the Council. Based on the evidence and my site visit, the development would be seen as part of the existing settlement of Uley, surrounded by residential dwellings. Overall, the proposal would conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the Cotswolds NL.
11. Additionally, the appeal site lies within the setting of the Uley Conservation Area (UCA). No concerns have been raised by the Council regarding the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the UCA. Having regard to the presented evidence and my observations on site, I see no reason to disagree with this view and confirm that the proposal would cause no harm to the significance of the UCA.
12. While I understand that the extension may have been designed to enhance the usability of the house for the current occupants and to accommodate visiting relatives, these personal circumstances do not outweigh the harm I have identified. Furthermore, although I acknowledge that the front garden is large enough to accommodate an extension of this size in isolation, this does not sufficiently mitigate the identified harm for the reasons outlined above. The absence of harm in relation to other considerations, such as the living conditions of neighbouring residents and the existing parking provision are neutral matters which do not weigh in favour of the proposal.

13. I note the proposal has the support of Uley Parish Council. However, this does not justify approving a development that I have found to be harmful and contrary to policy.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Manley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

S Edwards

INSPECTOR