



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 June 2025 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by Kenneth Stone BSc (Hons), DipTP, MRTPI.

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F1610/D/25/3363803

8 Notgrove Road, Cold Aston, Gloucestershire GL54 3BP

- 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 Mrs Nicola Drewett against the decision of Cotswold District Council.
 - The application reference is 25/00500/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a ground and first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - i) the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area; and,
 - ii) the living conditions of occupiers of 7 Notgrove Road, in terms of outlook and daylight.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is a semi-detached bungalow situated within a group of dwellings in the village of Cold Aston. The pair of dwellings are distinctive in the street scene as they are bungalows amongst a group of two-storey dwellings. They have a mostly matching appearance with a gable roof, a shared entrance door and consistent fenestration. While they do have a plain appearance, they nevertheless appear as a well-balanced and symmetrical pair. In that regard, the appeal property and the adjoining dwelling together contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. While the external materials of the extensions would be in keeping with the existing dwelling, given their overall scale the extensions would unacceptably dominate the host building. The excessive width of the side extension together with the absence of any obvious visual subservience would harm the balance of the pair and would

erode their distinctive symmetrical form. Furthermore, in design terms, the proposed canopy over the new entrance door would further detract from the visual consistency and the balance of the pair.

6. I therefore conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. It would conflict with Policies EN1 and EN2 of the Cotswolds District Local Plan (2018) (LP), which require that proposals are of a design quality that respects the character and distinctive appearance of the locality.
7. The proposal would also conflict with Appendix D of the Cotswolds Design Code (CDC), which is contained within Policy EN2 of the LP. The CDC states that extensions should respect the scale, proportions, materials and character of the building and should generally be subservient in height, area and overall mass to the original building, so that the form of the building is apparent.

Living conditions

8. The adjoining semi-detached property at 7 Notgrove Road (No 7) has a kitchen window in its rear elevation close to the side boundary to the appeal property. The kitchen window is in a section of the rear elevation stepped in from the main part of its rear elevation. The Council are concerned that the proposed rear extension would reduce the level of openness, which I understand to mean outlook, as well as daylight to the kitchen window at No 7.
9. However, due to the modest height of the rear extension and that it would be set away from the side boundary with No 7, the extension would not significantly reduce the level of outlook and daylight to their kitchen window. Furthermore, any reduction in daylight would be limited by virtue of the northern orientation of the rear elevations of the dwellings.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of occupiers of No 7, in terms of outlook and daylight. It would comply with Policy EN2 of the LP which states that proposals should accord with the CDC in that extensions should respect the amenity of dwellings and give due consideration to issues of daylight and an overbearing effect.

Other Matters

11. It is drawn to my attention that the appellant has a disability and health issues. It is explained that the proposal is sought to provide a comfortable living area as the property does not have significant space for a wheelchair, which has resulted in falls and trips. It is further commented that the property has leaks, dampness and poor insulation, which has resulted in stress and mental and physical health issues to the appellant. The proposal would also provide an extra bedroom for a future carer if needed and more natural light into the property.
12. While these issues are noted, there is limited detailed evidence before me which sets out the specific circumstances of the occupier of the property and the extent to which the proposed extension would meet their needs as is the contended justification for these particular extensions. Similarly, there is limited information before me which sets out why the circumstances of the occupier cannot be addressed through a proposal which would not have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, based on the evidence before

me, I agree with the Council's position that the appellant's personal circumstances do not justify the harm caused by the proposal in this instance.

13. In determining the appeal, I have had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) as set out in s149 of the Equality Act 2010. However, the harm that would be caused by the appeal proposal would outweigh its benefits in terms of eliminating discrimination against persons with the protected characteristics of disability, advancing equality of opportunity for those persons and fostering good relations between them and others.
14. The appeal site is also located within the Cotswolds National Landscape. While the effect to the National Landscape is not in dispute, great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Landscapes. In that regard, given that the harm of the proposal would be localised to the appeal property and its immediate context, I am therefore satisfied that no harm would arise to the Cotswolds National Landscape. However, this does not justify the harm of the proposal identified under the first main issue.
15. While I acknowledge that some letters of support were received from third parties, this does not justify the harm of the proposal. Furthermore, although the evidence suggests that the proposal was amended from the original scheme, my recommendation is based on the plans on which the Council made their decision and that amendments were provided does not lead me to a different conclusion.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Kenneth Stone

INSPECTOR