



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2025 by R Parker BSc (Hons)

Decision by S Edwards BA MATCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/24/3354613

Applegarth, Grove Lane to Orchard Place, Westend, Nupend, Stonehouse, Gloucestershire GL10 3SP

- 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 C Wright against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref is S.24/0851/HHOLD.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Erection of a two storey side extension and a front porch.'
-

This decision is issued in accordance with section 56 (2) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 as amended and supersedes that issued on 10 March 2025.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two storey side extension and a front porch at Applegarth, Grove Lane to Orchard Place, Westend, Nupend, Stonehouse, Gloucestershire GL10 3SP, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref S.24/0851/HHOLD, and the plans submitted with it, 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 accordance with drawing nos 101A and 103B.
 - 3) Within 3 months of commencement of the development hereby permitted, a specification (including methodology and programme of implementation) for the enhancement of biodiversity through the provision of one integrated bird and one integrated bat box shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved specification and programme of implementation and be retained thereafter.

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 description of the proposed development has been taken from the decision notice, as this more accurately reflects the plans provided.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and its surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is an end of terrace house in a generous plot, located within a rural village of mixed character. The wider terrace has a loose, somewhat disjointed rhythm, repeating elements in a lightly uneven manner. It, and the dwelling itself, are clearly of an attractive historic nature. However, numerous previous alterations and additions are evident, and the overall appearance is one which is not uncommon in a pastoral English context.
6. The surrounding village has a pleasant, verdant, feel, and comprises a mixture of dwelling types, with regard to age, style, size, and character. As such, the setting of the appeal site is one characterised by buildings which have been constructed and adapted over time.
7. The proposed extension would sit comfortably within the host plot, and its size and scale would accord with the overall irregular rhythm of the terrace. The drop in roof line would be enough to demonstrate a degree of subservience without introducing a jarring level change, while the use of matching materials would result in a cohesive relationship between the host dwelling and the proposed extension. While the porch element of the proposal may give the appearance of an additional dwelling, its inclusion would maintain the visual character of the terrace, complementing its existing rhythm.
8. The building in question has not been shown to be on a local list, and no evidence of a specific assessment to support its categorisation as a Non-Designated Heritage Asset (NDHA) has been provided. During my site visit, I observed that the host property, while historic, is not of an uncommon style or remarkable age, does not display distinctive architectural features, and has been subject to alterations and additions in the past. Therefore, and in the absence of further evidence to the contrary, I find that, while its historic nature is clear, it is not well-preserved or unique enough to qualify as an NDHA.
9. As outlined above, the appeal proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or its surrounding area. Therefore, it accords with Policy HC8 of the Stroud District Local Plan (November 2015) (Local Plan), which requires a high standard of design, complementary to the scale and style of the house to be extended and those nearby.
10. The building in question has not been robustly evidenced as an NDHA. Furthermore, due to its design, the proposal would reflect the altered historic character of the host property and the wider terrace. Therefore, it accords with Policy ES10 of the Local Plan, which supports proposals that protect their historic environment.

Other Matters

11. The appeal site lies within proximity to several Grade II listed buildings, which include Nupend House, Rose Tree Cottage, The Nestings and Sundial. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 stipulates that when considering whether to grant planning permission for

development which affects a listed building or its setting, the decision maker shall have special regard for the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest it possesses.

12. The significance of the listed buildings in this instance is derived chiefly from their historic interest, and architectural detailing as specified in each listing. Due to its distance from these buildings and the existing mixed nature of their general surroundings, the appeal proposal would not harmfully intrude within the setting of these listed buildings, and thus would preserve their significance.

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, I have attached a condition requiring the development to accord with the approved plans. These conditions are considered necessary in the interest of expediency and certainty, respectively.
14. I have also attached a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with a specification for enhancement of biodiversity with regard to bats and birds, subject to the approval of the Council. This condition is necessary to protect and enhance biodiversity.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

R Parker

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

S Edwards

INSPECTOR