



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 May 2025

by **Eleni Marshall BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F1610/D/25/3363890

The Maltings, High Street, South Cerney, Gloucestershire, GL7 5UP

- 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 Ms Jade Saunders against the decision of Cotswold District Council.
 - The application reference is 24/02370/FUL.
 - The development proposed is alterations to front porch including new render and erection of single storey side and rear extensions and alterations to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for alterations to front porch including new render and erection of single storey side and rear extensions and alterations to fenestration at The Maltings, High Street, South Cerney, Gloucestershire, GL7 5UP accordance with application ref: 24/02370/FUL and the plans submitted with it subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission;
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents: location plan (24-011-E-SLP), proposed site plan OPT3 (24-011-P-SP03), proposed elevations OPT3 (24-011-P-E03), proposed ground floor plan (24-011-P-GF03), proposed first floor plan (24-011-FF01), proposed second floor plan (24-011-P-SF01);
 - 3) The external materials used within the development hereby permitted shall match those of the existing building unless where specifically stated within the application forms or as labelled on the approved plans. The materials will be maintained for the lifetime of the development and any changes shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

Procedural Matters

2. I have utilised the Council's description of the proposal as I find that it more concisely describes the proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the impact of the proposal the host dwelling, as a non-designated heritage asset, and the wider South Cerney Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a detached dwelling which is located within the development boundary of South Cerney as well as standing within the South Cerney

Conservation Area (CA). It is understood that there is an Article 4(2) Direction which seeks to control many alterations within this location, which would not normally require planning permission, in order to prevent works that could threaten the preservation or enhancement of the character or appearance of the CA. Given that the site is within the South Cerney CA there is a requirement to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area in accordance with Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building in Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

5. The property is also noted to be adjacent to a Grade II listed building where, in accordance with Section 66(1) of the Act there is a requirement to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the setting of that building. The site itself is a non-designated heritage asset with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (the Framework) confirming that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in requiring a balanced judgment as to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
6. There are several elements to the appeal proposal. The Council's delegated report confirms that other alterations would not be objectionable in isolation, and I have no reason or evidence to conclude differently on those elements from the evidence before me or my site visit in relation to the single storey rear extension, alterations to the porch, the proposed dormer to the existing east facing roof slope and a window at first floor level within the west facing elevation. The stated refusal reason is therefore specific in it being based upon the proposed single storey side extension and proposed dormer window within the west facing elevation. This appeal will, therefore, focus on those elements in the context of the main issue.
7. The proposed single storey side extension, to the west facing elevation, would be a glazed flat roof structure with vertical divisional bars set within the glazing. The host dwelling is constructed utilising natural Cotswold stone, and the proposed side extension would contrast with the host dwelling to some extent as a result of the proposed design and contrasting materials. Despite this, and whilst the proposal would alter the existing floor plan of the main building and taking into account the acknowledged previous additions which have been permitted to the remaining elevations, I do not find that the proposal would diminish the significance and existing spatial character of the non-designated heritage asset. I find that the proposal would result in a modern contrast to the host dwelling and, in this case, that the contrast would create a beneficial juxtaposition between the modern and historic elements resulting in the extension not competing with the original dwelling.
8. The proposal, as a largely glazed addition, I find would appear comparatively lightweight as a structure in visual terms compared to the stone of the host dwelling itself. The scale of the proposal I find to be clearly subservient to the host dwelling. I do not find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the CA as a result of its modern approach. At the time of my site visit I found the location of the proposed side extension to be set back from the road, behind a wall, established boundary vegetation and an area which appeared to be utilised for parked vehicles along the roadside further breaking up any available views. I note, as raised by the Conservation Officer, that the boundary vegetation could be removed and I acknowledge this, albeit I have no evidence to suggest this would be removed given the privacy it affords the appeal site's garden area. Despite this,

even if the boundary vegetation was to be removed, I find that the proposal for the side extension element would still be appropriate in character and appearance of the CA due to the proposed juxtaposition that I find would result in the historic building being clearly legible and that the impact upon the appearance of the host dwelling and the CA would be neutral as a result of overall limited/only glimpsed views from beyond the boundary of the appeal site.

9. The proposed new dormer within the west facing roof slope would be physically attached to an existing side facing dormer window and linked with a section of walling. The proposed dormer would be of the same size, scale and materials as the existing dormer window with a matching casement window. Whilst the proposed dormer window in the western elevation would be visible from views within the street scene within the CA, I find that, in this case, the proposed design would not result in an uncharacteristic addition, nor would it harm the architectural and historical significance of the roof slope. I acknowledge that the cumulative impact of the proposed dormer would introduce further bulk and massing to the west facing roof slope, however, despite the cumulative impact I find that when viewed from the western elevation, and as seen on the submitted plans, the dormers are subservient in the context of the overall roof slope that would remain.
10. Overall, I find that the proposed single storey glazed side extension to the west facing elevation and the proposed dormer window would be appropriate in the context of the host dwelling as a non-designated heritage asset as well as appropriately preserving the character and appearance of the wider CA and the adjacent Grade II listed building as designated heritage assets. As a result of my finding of no harm to the CA and the adjacent building there is no requirement to go on to consider the public benefits of the proposal in this case.
11. The proposal would be consistent with Cotswold District Local Plan 2018 (LP) Policy EN2 which requires proposals to be of a design quality that respects the character and distinctive appearance of the locality and appendix D (the Cotswold Design Code) which outlines that extensions should respect the scale, proportions and character of the building, be in keeping with the building to which they are added and extensions should appear as a natural part of the evolution of the building and should look right. Overall, I find that the proposal is consistent with the overarching objectives set out within the Cotswold Design Code.
12. The proposal would also be consistent with LP Policy EN10 which confirms that development proposals that sustain and enhance the character, appearance and significance of designated heritage assets (and their settings), and put them to viable uses, consistent with their conservation, will be permitted and LP Policy EN11 which permits proposals where they preserve and where appropriate enhance the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The South Cerney Neighbourhood Plan (made December 2021) reiterates that new developments should harmonise with their surroundings and take into account documents such as, but not limited to, the Cotswold Design Guide.
13. The proposal would also be consistent with paragraph 135 of the Framework which seeks to ensure that developments function well and add to the overall quality of the area and are sympathetic to local character and history as well as Section 16 in relation to proposals affecting heritage assets including, for example, the requirement to take into account the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset and give great weight to the (designated heritage)

assets conservation. The scheme is also consistent with the objectives of Section 66(1) and 72(1) of the Act for the reasons I have set out above.

Other Matters

14. I note that there is an objection, from the Parish Council to the proposal. I have dealt with matters relating to design and the Conservation Area in the context of the main issue within this decision letter.

Conditions

15. The Council, within their questionnaire, have suggested three conditions in the event this appeal is allowed which I have considered and applied as appropriate. A time condition is attached to comply with Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. A condition requiring the development to be in accordance with the approved plans is required to control and define the development which is granted consent. A materials condition is required to ensure an appropriate finish in accordance with the details submitted and in order to match those used in the existing building where applicable to ensure a high quality and appropriate finish.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

Eleni Marshall

INSPECTOR