



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2025

By G Powys Jones FRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/25/3361516

Holly Tree Farm, Ham Lane, Oldbury-on-Severn, South Gloucestershire, BS35 1PZ

- 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 Kevin Evans against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P24/02517/HH.
 - The development proposed is the erection of 2No single storey extensions to form additional living accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of 2No single storey extensions to form additional living accommodation at Holly Tree Farm, Ham Lane, Oldbury-on-Severn, South Gloucestershire, BS35 1PZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/02517/HH, subject to the conditions set out in the accompanying Schedule.

Procedural matters

2. The appeal arises from a resubmission following an earlier refusal of planning permission for a different and more substantial scheme. The initial scheme was refused permission for two reasons, the second of which related to heritage issues. The scheme was considered to have a harmful effect on what the Council describe as the historic character and appearance of the host property, treated by the Council as a non-designated heritage asset. It was also considered to detract from the setting of a listed building, a well sited in the host property's front garden.
3. Largely on the advice of its Conservation Officer, the Council raises no objection to the revised scheme on heritage grounds, and the second reason for refusal imposed on the previous refusal has been dropped. Nevertheless, I have a duty to assess the effect of the proposal on the heritage asset, albeit non-designated, and on the setting of the listed building. These matters are considered later.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the host property and the setting of the listed building.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached dwelling set in large gardens on the fringes of the village. The house presents two distinct elements to the lane it fronts with a

simplicity of form and uncomplicated ridged roofs. The two-storey element is stone faced, whilst a lengthy single storey element protrudes northwards alongside. In the front garden is the listed well (*Grade II*).

6. The extensions would both take place to the rear, where the dwelling displays contrasting characteristics to those apparent at the front in terms of form and materials. Here the two-storey element is rendered and painted, and its roof form varied, indicating that the dwelling has been subject to alteration and change in the past, a factor recognised by the Council, which describes the rear of the dwelling as having an '*already convoluted disparate composition*'.
7. To my mind, it is in this visual context at the rear that the proposals should be judged since the proposals have no impact on the pleasant and attractive front elevation. The smaller of the proposed extensions is modestly sized, and if considered on its own, the Council would have found its impact acceptable, as do I since as the Council's acknowledges, it integrates visually with the host property in this position.
8. The other proposed rear extension would be larger in scale, with an oak frame and slated roof. Its design contrasts with that of the host property, but the lightness of the structure, with its extensive glazing would enable it to be appreciated as an acceptably designed conservatory or pavilion type addition to the host property. It would sit acceptably here in my view without causing visual offence.
9. The host property is most appreciated in terms of its contribution to local heritage at the front. The extensions would have no impact on the public's current perception of the building. I walked a length of the public footpath running from Ham Lane alongside the appeal site's southern boundary towards the River Severn. This boundary is well vegetated with plants and trees, including many evergreens. These effectively screen the property's rear elevation from public view. The extensions would thus be hardly perceptible having little or no impact on their publicly accessible surroundings outside the site.
10. The extensions would thus not have an unacceptable impact on the non-designated heritage asset, nor to my mind would the setting of the listed well be materially affected. The well and extensions would not be seen and appreciated in the same visual plane. Indeed, the well's setting would be left unaffected by the proposals, if built.
11. I conclude that the proposed development would fit acceptably and unobtrusively into its visual context, without materially affecting the character and appearance of the host property or its surroundings, or the setting of the listed building at the front of the dwelling.
12. Accordingly, no conflict arises with those provisions of policies CS1 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Core Strategy (December 2013) and PSP1 & PSP38 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan (November 2017) directed to promote and encourage high quality design generally, and specifically in residential extensions.

Conditions

13. In the interests of certainty, it is important that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, and a condition to this effect is imposed. The

Council's suggested standard condition on materials is not considered appropriate, but another condition on materials is imposed in the interests of certainty and visual amenity.

14. The Council has not suggested another condition. However, I note that in the response to archaeological consultation it was commented that '*..the site has archaeological potential as it is in the early medieval settlement of Oldbury on Severn and is c.70m from Oldbury Camp Iron Age hillfort (Scheduled Monument).*'
15. A condition requiring a watching brief was recommended, but no specific wording was suggested. In view of the archaeological significance of the locality and the proximity of the Ancient Monument I consider the imposition of such condition to be necessary.
16. All other matters raised in the representations have been considered but none is of such strength or significance as to outweigh the considerations leading to my conclusions.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: location plan and Drawings Ref 01; 02; 03; 04; BL.01 & BL.02.
- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be those described in the application form and supporting statement.
- 4) The developer shall notify the local planning authority of the intention to commence development and shall not commence development until 8 weeks has expired since first notifying the local planning authority. Thereafter the developer shall afford access to the site at all reasonable times to any archaeologist nominated by the local planning authority and shall allow that person to observe the excavations and record items of interest and finds.