



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 4 June 2025

by **A Tucker BA (Hons) IHBC**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 June 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/C1625/W/24/3355770

Thatched Cottage, Arlebrook Farm Lane, Standish, Stonehouse, Gloucestershire GL10 3DQ

- 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 Richard Faith against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref is S.24/1121/HHOLD.
 - The development proposed is demolition of C20 outshoot kitchen extension and replacement with a new single storey extension containing kitchen, relocated bathroom and dedicated entrance area. Demolition of garden shed and wood store at the rear of the property and replacement with garden utility room. Fabric repairs to the historic building including upgrade of C20 windows, render coat to masonry, removal of asbestos.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/C1625/Y/24/3355772

Thatched Cottage, Arlebrook Farm Lane, Standish, Stonehouse, Gloucestershire GL10 3DQ

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Richard Faith against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref is S.24/1122/LBC.
 - The works proposed are demolition of C20 outshoot kitchen extension and replacement with a new single storey extension containing kitchen, relocated bathroom and dedicated entrance area. Demolition of garden shed and wood store at the rear of the property and replacement with garden utility room. Fabric repairs to the historic building including upgrade of C20 windows, render coat to masonry, removal of asbestos.
-

Decisions

1. The appeals are dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeals relate to the same scheme under different legislation. I have dealt with both appeals together in my reasoning.
3. On 12 December 2024 the Government published its revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Comments received from the main parties in respect of this have been taken into account in my decision.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal upon the significance of the grade II listed building known as Thatched Cottage¹.

¹ List Entry Number: 1387171

Reasons

5. Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBCA) require the decision maker to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
6. The building dates from the 16th century. Its walls are timber framed to the front and rear, with masonry gables to either side. Over these sits a steeply pitched thatched roof with a deep profile. Although the internal accommodation rises to three floors at the southern end, the thatch extends down to form an eaves that is only just higher than the top of the main ground floor level. This arrangement gives the building a modest scale and means that the long slopes of its thatched roof are a prominent and significant component of its exterior. Most openings are within the front or rear walls and are randomly positioned within the timber frame, with the thatch cut to account for two unaligned dormers at the front.
7. A small lean-to extension sits against the building's north gable. This provides the current kitchen. It is poorly constructed and has no inherent historic interest. However, it has a modest and additive form, and inoffensive appearance. It leans against one end of the building in a traditional manner and does not harm the building's special interest. Internally, the building retains its historic plan form and features that include a large stone fireplace against the north wall, with lobby entrance to the west.
8. The primary significance of the building is derived from its traditional vernacular form and appearance, including its simple and modestly undulating timber frame and the thick profile of its long slopes of thatch to the front and rear. Significance is also derived from its historic fabric and planform.
9. The proposal would see the lean-to extension removed and replaced with an extension that would be set away from the north gable and linked by a glazed entrance hall. It would have a low pitched slate roof that would be orientated to match the existing thatched roof and its walls would be rendered and framed to echo the historic timber frame of the host building.
10. Its slack roof pitch would give the extension a roof to wall ratio that would be very different to the host building. It would have a squat form that would appear out of place alongside the steep and prominent thatched roof. This would be emphasised by the eaves height, the expressed frame, the position of the windows and their proportions. The eaves would appear to be too high for a modest single storey extension, an arrangement that would be emphasised by the blank section of framing above the windows and the window's low position within the walls. I can understand why the frame has been replicated in this way, and I can see that considerable effort has gone into the design approach. However, I suggest that replicating the timber frame in this way could appear too forced or rigid, and somewhat at odds with the organic way that the building has developed.
11. Additionally, the windows would adopt either square or horizontal proportions, which would emphasise the width and length of the extension. Similarly, the glazed link would have a roof level that would be well above the height of the doors and would appear over scaled alongside the low level of the existing ground floor. These matters would result in an extension that would appear out of place and ill proportioned alongside the historic building. It would fail to respond positively to

the strong vertical proportions of the existing building and the poor relationship would draw the eye. It would harm the appearance of the host building and detract from its cottage garden setting, causing significant harm to the building's significance.

12. The Council raised concern more generally about the principle of extending to the side of the building, suggesting that this would harm the legibility of the house as a standalone dwelling sat centrally within the plot. Despite my findings above I am satisfied that there is some potential for extending to the side of the dwelling as a matter of principle; and that the informal siting of the building in its plot and its vernacular character should not necessarily prevent this.
13. In other respects, I note that the scheme has been carefully considered. The principle of offsetting the extension by using a small link has merit, and is often used as a successful way of providing additional accommodation whilst leaving the form and scale of the host building clearly expressed. However, for the reasons given I am not satisfied that this would be successfully executed in the proposed scheme.
14. The dense planting of the large garden that surrounds the building would provide significant screening. There are however many positions within the grounds where the building would be easily viewed with the extension, and where its harmful form and scale would be apparent.
15. The glazed link would better reveal the original north gable. This is however already readily appreciated despite the presence of the existing lean-to, and I am not therefore satisfied that this is a benefit of the scheme.
16. A dark render is suggested to reduce the proposal's impact. This would not address the broader matters that I have raised regarding the low pitched roof and overall form of the extension.
17. Several examples of contemporary single storey extensions to historic dwellings have been provided in support of the proposal. They demonstrate a range of approaches, and some are prominent and assertive additions. None are however directly comparable to the appeal proposal, and it is important, especially with a vernacular building such as this, to assess the proposal on its own merits. These do not cause me to come to a different view on the merits of the appeal proposal.
18. I have found that the proposal would cause significant harm to the special interest of the listed building. In terms of the Framework, the harm would be less than substantial but would nevertheless be of considerable importance and weight. Paragraph 215 of the Framework establishes that any harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
19. The proposal would secure the much needed repair and updating of the building, and would offer the considerable benefit of moving both bathrooms and all plumbing out of the historic building. This would help to address identified concerns regarding the build up of condensation and leaks. Additionally, the extension and outbuilding would provide alternative living spaces that would be more thermally efficient than other parts of the building, which would improve how the dwelling functions for its occupants.

20. Thermal upgrading of the existing building would take place where possible, including the installation of vacuum double glazing, and the proposal would incorporate photovoltaic panels. Paragraph 167 of the Framework states that significant weight should be given to such interventions, although this paragraph makes it clear that the Policies in Chapter 16 of the Framework should also apply for proposals that affect a heritage asset. Other matters would be addressed such as upgrading wiring, drainage, dealing with asbestos, and the general safety of the building including means of escape.
21. Together these improvements would benefit the building's fabric and would improve its functionality as a dwelling. They can be accepted as public benefits, as they would secure the future conservation of the building and ensure it remains viable as a dwelling, thus securing its optimum viable use into the future. They attract considerable weight.
22. Paragraph 212 of the Framework states that great weight should be given to the conservation of a heritage asset. In weighing these matters I am mindful that there are alternative ways to extend the building that would achieve similar benefits. Paragraph 213 of the Framework states that any harm should require clear and convincing justification, and there is nothing before me to justify this particular design approach. With this in mind, although the public benefits carry considerable weight, they are not sufficient to outweigh the level of harm identified.
23. In summary, the proposal would fail to meet the requirements of the LBCA as it would harm the special interest of the listed building. It would also fail to accord with Policies HC8 and ES10 of the Stroud District Local Plan 2015, which seek to ensure that the height, scale, form and design of an extension is in keeping with the scale and character of the original dwelling, and that proposals conserve and where appropriate enhance heritage assets.

Conclusion

24. For the reasons given, the appeals should be dismissed.

A Tucker

INSPECTOR