



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 August 2025

by Eleni Marshall BSc (Hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/25/3368844

Tanyard, Road from Church Court Cottage to Tanhouse Farm, Frampton on Severn, Gloucestershire, GL2 7EH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mike Williams against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application reference is S.25/0236/HHOLD.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single storey extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension at Tanyard, Frampton on Severn, Gloucestershire, GL2 7EH in accordance with application ref: S.25/0236/HHOLD and the plans submitted with it subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Procedural Matters

2. I have utilised the Council's description of the development as per the decision notice as I feel it more concisely describes the development.
3. The appeal is accompanied by an application for costs which is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the design and character of the existing property.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located to the Southwest of Frampton on Severn and comprises a former agricultural outbuilding which gained planning permission to be converted into a dwelling (S.15/0259/COU) with that permission including the removal of householder permitted development rights in order to control, and consider on its own merits, any further alterations or extension to the property once converted. The host dwelling is a red brick, clay tiled roof, structure which is one and a half storeys in height with single storey elements as can be seen from the existing plans.
6. The proposal seeks to construct a single storey extension (hipped) to the side of the property which would result in a U-shaped built form to the property (in conjunction with the former piggery). From my site visit, and the plans, there is evidently a hipped roof – a roof where all sides slope downwards with no gables or vertical sides (not a simple, single sloped, roof i.e. a lean-to). Even forgetting

specific terminology for the roof structures, I find the proposal would clearly replicate and share strong consistency with a roof design already in existence on the building. The roof design I find would be consistent with, and would match, the roof form of the existing dwelling as a result of essentially continuing the roof pitch of the existing single storey element which wraps around the property to provide a bathroom and kitchen (as shown on the existing plans).

7. Bi-fold doors would introduce a large opening on the host dwelling; however, I find this would broadly mirror and be consistent with the long bank of windows present on the existing single storey projection which has a glass frontage facing into the garden. The means of opening a section of glass in an elevation is, I find, a moot point. The proposal would still result in a large glass opening where there are clearly existing large openings/a long bank of windows in the existing building. I find that, overall, the proposal would be consistent with the existing design and character of the existing property and would be one which would represent an overall modest extension to the host dwelling.
8. The property is noted to be a former agricultural barn, and I note, from my site visit, that the conversion has managed to retain an agricultural character to the structure with its simple detailing and design. In that regard, for the reasons outlined above, I find that the proposal submitted would not have an awkward architectural relationship and that it would be appropriate and in keeping with the design of the host dwelling. The proposal would ultimately result in an addition which would be subordinate in nature, and which would preserve the traditional rural aesthetic of the former agricultural building as a residential conversion. The proposal would be appropriate in terms of design and character of the existing property, for the reasons outlined, as well as its semi-rural context.
9. I note that the appeal site benefits from a currently extant planning permission (S.22/1337/HHOLD granted on appeal APP/C1625/D/22/3309720), however, the Council have provided a copy of the previously approved plans and taking into account the roof structure and the two proposals I do not find that, overall, they would be compatible or able to be logically implemented together in the event this appeal was allowed. The Council acknowledge the extant permission but do not raise this as a specific reason for refusal, in terms of interaction between the two. In arriving at their decision. The previous appeal allowed a single storey extension, but the roof pitch/design would not be compatible with the hip roof of the proposal that is before me which would effectively be the continuation of the single storey element around the host dwelling to the southeastern end of the building.
10. The proposal would be consistent with Stroud District Local Plan 2015 Policy HC8 which requires that permission will only be granted for the extension of residential properties provided the height, scale, form and design of the extension is in keeping with the scale and character of the original dwelling (taking into account any cumulative additions), and the site's wider setting and location and Criterion 5 of Policy CP14 which supports development where it will achieve an appropriate design and appearance, which is respectful of the surroundings, including local topography, built environment and heritage.

Other Matters

11. The Council confirm that the proposal would not affect the setting or significance of the Frampton on Severn Conservation Area or the Malt House (noted to be Grade

II Listed – to the north), or any other heritage assets within the vicinity of the appeal site. Based upon my site visit, and the evidence before me, I have no reason to conclude differently on these matters.

12. It is acknowledged that there is a public right of way (PROW) to the south of the property, however, I find that the proposal is acceptable for the reasons set out and the presence of the PROW, or views of the proposal from it, would not result in any issues that I find would be sufficient to warrant refusal.

Conditions

13. The Council have suggested three conditions in the event the appeal is allowed which I have considered and applied as appropriate. A time condition is attached to comply with Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. A condition requiring the development to be in accordance with the approved plans as required to control and define the development which is granted consent.
14. A materials condition is required to ensure an appropriate finish in the interests of visual amenities of the area and taking into account the semi-rural setting of the host dwelling. I have amended this condition, in comparison to the suggested condition by the Council, as I do not find there is a requirement for samples of materials to be submitted and approved in writing when the application form confirms that the proposed materials and finished are intended to match those as existing within the host dwelling. Any deviation from matching the existing materials will require submission, and approval, in writing prior to the materials being utilised on site.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

Eleni Marshall

INSPECTOR

Conditions Schedule

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission;
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents: Location Plan (25.002.01 submitted 06.02.2025), Site Plan (25.002.02 submitted 06.02.2025) and proposed elevations and floor plans (25.002.04 A submitted 06.02.2025);
- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby approved shall match those used in the existing building. The materials will be maintained for the lifetime of the development and any changes shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority prior to any alterations on site.