
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 August 2025 by M Jones

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 07 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/F1610/D/25/3368030

The Hawthorns, Sterling Close, Stow-on-the-Wold, Gloucestershire, GL54 1AN

- 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 Nick Cafearo and Mrs May Cafearo against the decision of Cotswold District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00440/FUL.
 - The development proposed is erection of ground floor and first floor rear extensions, replacement of existing rear dormer flat roof with pitched roof, replacement of existing front porch flat roof with pitched roof, removal of existing front dormer and replacement with roof light, alterations to fenestration on front and side elevations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of ground floor and first floor rear extensions, replacement of existing rear dormer flat roof with pitched roof, replacement of existing front porch flat roof with pitched roof, removal of existing front dormer and replacement with roof light, alterations to fenestration on front and side elevations at The Hawthorns, Stow-on-the-Wold, Gloucestershire, GL54 1AN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/00440/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with approved plans: P04, P05 and P06 Rev P01.
 - 3) The materials used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing dwelling, including the mortar, colour and coursing of the reconstituted stone.

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.

Preliminary Matters

3. The description of development included in the banner heading and Decision is taken from the Council's decision notice, as it more accurately reflects the appeal proposal than the description on the application form.
4. The appellant has submitted a revised drawing (P06 Rev P01) at appeal stage which shows the proposed first floor rear extension and existing rear dormer

finished in reconstituted Cotswold stone, as opposed to the vertical timber cladding proposed in the original drawing (P06). The proposed change is not substantial and does not relate to the Council's fundamental concerns about the design and scale of the proposed development and its subsequent impacts. As such, I do not consider that accepting the new drawing would prejudice the Council or any other interested party. I have therefore taken the revised drawing into account when making my recommendation.

Main Issue

5. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and local area and on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property, Avalon, with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and appearance

6. The appeal site comprises a detached chalet bungalow mainly finished with reconstituted Cotswold stone and concrete plain tiles, sited on a generous plot with front and rear gardens. The houses on Sterling Close and nearby streets have a mix of styles but most have generous plots and several have substantial rear extensions. There is no defined pattern of fenestration in the local area, with a mix of rooflights and dormer windows and irregular spacing between windows.
7. The existing flat roof above the front porch is awkward and does not fit easily with the pitched roofs of the front projection and front dormers. The proposed pitched roof would be more in keeping with the front elevation of the appeal dwelling and those of other properties in the local area. To accommodate this, the dormer window above the front porch would be removed and replaced by a rooflight. This solution would prevent the front elevation from appearing overly cluttered and would maintain the number of pitched roofs on the front elevation, keeping the visual balance.
8. While not symmetrical, the arrangement of rooflight and offset dormer windows would be consistent with several other dwellings nearby, and there is little symmetry or consistent pattern to such openings in the Close. Consequently, the proposed alterations to the front elevation would be compatible with the existing dwelling and pattern of development in the local area.
9. The proposed rear extensions would enlarge the footprint of the appeal dwelling and would add bulk to the rear elevation. However, when seen in the context of the width of the existing bungalow and its large plot, they would not be an inappropriate size or appear excessively bulky or crowded. They would also only be visible from the rear garden and from neighbouring properties, so would have a limited impact on the character and appearance of the area.
10. The proposed rear extensions would have a simple and uncomplicated design that would respect the scale, proportions, materials and character of the existing dwelling. The first-floor rear extension would be set down from the roof ridgeline and set in from the side elevation, and the ground floor rear extension would not extend across the full width of the rear elevation. Furthermore, the extensions would not protrude past the depth of the existing ground floor rear extension. As

such, the rear extensions would not appear overly dominant and would be subservient to the existing dwelling in height, depth and scale.

11. Gable roofed projections of various sizes on front and rear elevations are common in the area and there are numerous properties visible from the appeal site with substantial rear extensions. In some cases, these have different roof pitches and eaves heights to the main dwelling. Consequently, in this context the design, bulk and scale of the proposed rear extensions, including the shallower roof pitch and higher eaves, would not appear as dominant or incongruous additions to the appeal property. The use of reconstituted Cotswold stone would be sympathetic and enable the extensions to blend with the existing property, subject to appropriate detailing which can be secured by condition.
12. The proposed first-floor rear extension would increase the height of the dwelling next to its neighbour, Avalon. However, dwellings in Sterling Close vary considerably in size and scale, with taller houses sitting alongside bungalows. The proposed development would not increase the roof height of the appeal dwelling, which would remain similar to that of Avalon. As a result, the relationship between the two properties in the street scene would be largely unaltered.
13. For these reasons, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host property or the local area and so would comply with Policy EN2 of the Cotswold District Local Plan (2018) and the relevant provisions of the Cotswold Design Code (2018) which require proposals to respect the scale, proportions, materials and character of the original dwelling and be generally subservient in height, area and overall mass.
14. There would also be no conflict with the design policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which require development to be sympathetic to local character and the surrounding built environment.

Living conditions

15. Avalon sits close to the appeal site boundary and has several ground floor rear facing windows, the closest of which to the appeal site sits in a recess between the rear projections on Avalon and the appeal property. As a result, the outlook of this rear window is already restricted.
16. While the proposed rear two storey extension would significantly increase the height of the wall and roof of the rear projection, the depth would be no greater than the existing rear extension. Therefore, although the proposal would reduce outlook to the side from the closest window of Avalon, this would be a minor impact compared with the effect of the existing extension and its pitched roof. The room would still benefit from an outlook to Avalon's large rear garden. Additionally, the gap between the properties would remain the same and the outlook from the other habitable rooms at the rear of Avalon, as well as the occupiers' enjoyment of the garden, would be largely unimpeded by the proposal. Consequently, the slight reduction in outlook as compared with the current situation would respect the amenity of Avalon and would not cause a significant or harmful overbearing effect.
17. For these reasons, the proposed development would not have a harmful adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of Avalon with particular regard to outlook. Therefore, it would comply with Policy EN2 of the Cotswold District Local Plan and the relevant provisions of the Cotswold Design Code which aim to ensure

that new developments respect the amenity of neighbouring dwellings giving due consideration to any overbearing effect. There would also be no conflict with the Framework policies which require a high standard of amenity.

Conditions

18. A condition setting out the standard time period for commencement of the development is necessary in the interests of expediency. I also recommend a condition requiring the development to accord with the approved plans as this provides certainty.
19. I further recommend a condition requiring use of matching materials and reconstituted stone detailing, to ensure an appropriate appearance for the development taking into account the character and appearance of the local area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

20. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

M Jones

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

21. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and agree with the reasoning and recommendation. On that basis, the appeal is allowed subject to the conditions listed above.

L McKay

INSPECTOR