



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 June 2025

By G Powys Jones FRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/D/25/3364359

Meadow Cottage, Shellards Lane, Alveston, Gloucestershire, BS35 3SY

- 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 Devid Templar against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P24/02627/HH.
 - The development is the erection of a single storey side extension to form additional living accommodation and erection of rear veranda.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey side extension to form additional living accommodation and erection of rear veranda at Meadow Cottage, Shellards Lane, Alveston, Gloucestershire, BS35 3SY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/02627/HH.

Procedural matters

2. The development subject of the appeal has been built and the appellant wishes to retain it. I shall therefore treat the appeal as if the original application had been submitted under section 73A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
3. Brief reference is made in the officer report to the planning history of the site. In respect of Meadow Cottage, it is said:

Planning history presents that Meadow Cottage was rebuilt following the grant of planning permission P99/1399¹. Approximately 30% increase in floor-space was permitted as part of the replacement dwelling scheme.

4. This strongly suggests to me that Meadow Cottage is a new, replacement dwelling built during the earlier part of this century. Although little detail is provided, it appears that permission was granted for a single storey front extension to Meadow Cottage to form a porch in 2005, and another permission was granted for the erection of a detached double garage and tack room in 2009. No information is provided as to whether the latter was treated as an extension or addition to Meadow Cottage or as an outbuilding in its own right.
5. Reference is also made to the presence of other outbuildings on the site for which the Council say they have no record of planning permissions having been granted.

¹ Dated 1 June 1999

No firm indication is given in the officer report as to whether enforcement investigations or actions have been or ever were considered or commenced in respect of these outbuildings, or whether the Council considers them immune from enforcement action for any reason². In the absence of appropriate information, I make no inference either way on this aspect.

6. The appeal site lies within the Green Belt (GB).

Main Issues

7. The main issues are: (a) whether the development is inappropriate development in the GB for the purposes of the Framework³ and development plan policy, and (b) the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings.

Reasons

Whether inappropriate development

8. The Framework establishes that the construction of new buildings in the GB should be regarded as inappropriate unless one of the specified exceptions applies. These include the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building. The development carried out amounts to an extension or alteration to a building.
9. Policy CS5 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy (CS) provides that proposals for development in the GB must comply with the provisions of the Framework. Policy PSP7 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan: Policies, Sites and Places Plan (LP) provides more detailed policy guidance in that it sets out in empirical terms the level of volume increases to the original building likely to be considered as disproportionate or not disproportionate additions.
10. The term '*original building*' is used in both national and local policy. In terms of national policy, since Meadow Cottage was constructed after 1 July 1948, the original building is that as it was built originally. For the purposes of LP policy PSP7, the term refers to the volume of Meadow Cottage when the original planning permission for its construction was given.
11. They are similar definitions, but despite the provisions of local policy, the officer report is silent on volume calculations which I would regard as essential in order to properly apply the terms of LP policy PSP7. I note the reference in the officer report to a 30% increase in volume allowed for in the construction of the replacement dwelling, but this should not in my view be taken into consideration in any empirical calculation or exercise of judgment on proportionality having regard to the definitions of '*original building*' found in local and national policy. Reference is also made in the officer report to an increased footprint, but the relevance of this aspect is not adequately explained in the context of local policy, where volumes is the currency used.
12. The judgment to be made is whether the extension and alterations carried out to Meadow Cottage as originally approved and built, and/or as altered or extended since, are disproportionate or not.

² As permitted development for example, or by the passage of time.

³ The National Planning Policy Framework

13. Judging from the officer report it appears that the Council took account of the existence of the outbuildings, referred to in paragraph 4 above, in its assessment. I do not intend to follow their example since I am not persuaded that the outbuildings should be treated as additions or alterations to the original building. All outbuildings which existed prior to the erection of the extension and veranda subject of the appeal were clearly and physically separated from the host property, and I have not therefore treated them as extensions or additions to the original building.
14. In the absence of empirical information on volumes, I shall make the necessary subjective assessment required under the terms of national policy. Meadow Cottage is a two storey semi-detached dwelling with twin pitched tiled roofs. The extension has been built to the side, infilling a previous gap. The veranda has been erected to the rear of the extension and continues behind the main house.
15. Viewed from the front and rear, the single storey extension in terms of its height, scale, size and mass appears to me to be entirely proportionate to that of the host property, taking full account of the modest porch extension granted permission ten years ago. The veranda is a light structure and, by definition, is open providing shelter from the elements for those who choose to sit or walk beneath its roof. I do not regard either of the elements as being disproportionate extensions or additions to the original building.
16. It follows logically that I conclude the development is not inappropriate development in the GB in terms of national policy, and is compliant with CS policy CS5 for this reason.

Character and appearance

17. The property is sited alongside a country lane deep within the Gloucestershire countryside. The site's frontage and other boundaries are well vegetated by luxuriant trees and undergrowth, with the result that the house is barely seen from outside the site, as the Council acknowledges. The side extension is of a simple construction, but as the Council points out, its roof is of a different shape to that of the host property and built in different materials. The extension looks modern yet complements the main house's proportions and character. The contrasting roof shape and materials add visual interest and are unobjectionable. The veranda is an open structure which marries well with the appearance of the host property and extension.
18. I conclude that the development fits acceptably and unobtrusively into its visual context, without materially affecting the character and appearance of the host property or its surroundings. 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.

Other matters

19. The Council has suggested that a condition be imposed requiring the development to be built in accordance with the approved plans. However, since the extension and additions are substantially complete this is considered unnecessary. No other conditions are deemed necessary since the development is already complete.

20. All other matters raised in the representations have been considered, including the references to other development plan policies and local guidance on residential extensions, but none is of such strength or significance as to outweigh the considerations leading to my conclusions.
21. The appeal therefore succeeds and planning permission to retain the extension and veranda is granted.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR