



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 May 2025

by **J P Longmuir BA(Hons) DipUD MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F1610/W/24/3352274

Safari Tent Site, Notgrove, Cheltenham, Glos, GL54 3BT

- 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 Harry Acland against the decision of Cotswold District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01717/FUL.
 - The development proposed is access track, hard standing and hook ups for 15 caravan or camper vans.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal site is within the Notgrove Conservation Area and within the registered Grade II Notgrove Manor Park and Garden¹.
3. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area. I am also mindful of the historic environment policies within the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) that relate to the significance of designated heritage assets and their settings and the Planning Practice Guidance on the Historic environment.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposed development would conserve the character and appearance of the Notgrove Conservation Area (CA) and the effect on the registered Grade II Notgrove Manor Park and Garden.

Reasons

5. The Manor Park and Garden have been designed around the three storey Manor House, built with stone walls and roof, as gardens and pleasure grounds. They are sub- divided into particular areas, and the designation also includes parkland. The list description notes the parkland trees, particularly beech and horse chestnuts.
6. The CA covers much of the stone architecture in the village and the adjacent parkland. Its character is derived from its drystone boundary walls, broad leaf trees, sense of openness and rurality whereby the buildings do not dominate but

¹ List entry : 1000775

appear recessive into the landscape. Indeed, much of the village is in a dip below the surrounding undulating fields.

7. The appeal site is a largely open field, with a swath of mature trees along the boundaries. On two sides it is bordered by lanes and low drystone walls. The Lodge adjacent to one corner, is notable for its stone walling, modest proportions and gabled roof, marking the private drive and entrance to The Manor, emphasised by stone pillars and ornate metal entrance gates. Within one part of the appeal site field, there are 5 large tents for holiday accommodation. These have a muted appearance being in fabric, with buff coloured walls and olive green roofs and timber decking. In addition, a small building is on the boundary of one frontage, which provides basic amenities, is similarly subdued with stone walls, plain brown tiled roof, and lacking windows on its public facing side.
8. The appeal site contributes to the CA by its openness and rurality, which allows the trees and walls to stand out on the entrance to the village. It contributes to the rural setting of The Lodge by allowing it to be the focus of attention.
9. The proposal is for up to 15 caravans or camper vans on the site. They would have metallic textures and potentially a variety of colours, some of which would be expected to stand out particularly white.
10. The caravans/camper vans would be experienced from the road frontages, being visible through the gaps in the rows of trees. In particular the proposed access way has a large opening through which many of them would be seen together, thereby exacerbating their presence. They would attract attention away from the walls, trees and grassland, thereby harming the approach into the village. Similarly, the vehicles would impair the prominence of The Lodge.
11. The submitted evidence refers to events taking place on and around the appeal site. The particular durations and details have not been provided, but nonetheless this proposal seeks a permanent permission, and the effects would be potentially prevalent for considerable time.
12. I therefore find that the proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area, and registered park and garden and a high point within that spectrum. Policy EN1 of the Cotswold District Local Plan requires new development protects and enhances the historic environment. EN4 requires proposals take account of historic landscape character. EN10 requires great weight is given to a designated assets conservation. EN11 states proposal should preserve and where appropriate enhance the special character and appearance of conservation areas, in terms of siting, scale, form, proportion, design, materials and retention of positive features. The proposal would be contrary to the above policies as well as section 72 of the Act.

Heritage and Planning Balances

13. Whilst the harm arising would be less than substantial; however, paragraph 212 of the Framework advocates great weight to the asset's conservation. I therefore give considerable importance and weight to the harm I have identified in my balancing judgment below. In addition, paragraph 213 of the Framework emphasises that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset, should require clear and convincing justification.

14. Paragraph 215 of the Framework directs that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including where appropriate securing its optimum viable use.
15. The proposal would increase visitors staying in the area which would support the local economy and the vitality/viability of local facilities. However, this benefit would be limited.
16. Taking the public benefits together as a whole I conclude that they would not be of sufficient weight to outweigh the high point in the less than substantial harm spectrum identified to the significance and special interest of the site and its contribution to the Conservation Area and registered park and garden.
17. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 states determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Paragraph 11(c) of the Framework states that decision taking means approving development proposals that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay. The proposal would be contrary to the Development Plan when taken as a whole and material considerations do not indicate the proposals should be approved.
18. The third reason for refusal refers to insufficient information being submitted to demonstrate a biodiversity net gain. However, due to the above it is not necessary for me to consider that issue.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Longmuir

INSPECTOR