



Development Control Committee Schedule 13/06/2023

Item No:	02
Application No.	S.23/0335/HHOLD
Site Address	Richmond Cottage, Rockstowes, Uley Road, Dursley
Town/Parish	Uley Parish Council
Grid Reference	378017,197865
Application Type	Householder Application
Proposal	Erection of first floor extension, alterations to existing house, new rear terrace & external car port/ battery store.
Recommendation	Refusal
Call in Request	Cllr Martin Pearcy





Development Control Committee Schedule 13/06/2023

Applicant's Details	Mr & Mrs D & R Jones Richmond Cottage, Rockstowes, Uley Road, Dursley, Gloucestershire GL11 5AF
Agent's Details	Thomas Dean Architects Ltd Rhyne Cottage, Moreton Valence, Gloucester, Gloucestershire, GL2 7NA
Case Officer	Isobella Wise
Application Validated	20.02.2023
	CONSULTEES
Comments Received	Uley Parish Council Contaminated Land Officer (E) Biodiversity Team Public Rights Of Way Officer
Constraints	Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Consult area Nympsfield Airfield Zone Uley Parish Council Village Design Statement
	OFFICER'S REPORT

MAIN ISSUES

- o Design and Appearance
- o Residential Amenity
- o Landscape Character
- o Highways
- o Biodiversity
- o Heritage Assets

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The application site comprises a detached Victorian period dwelling with walls finished in stone and render; the wider setting is rural in character with the topography rising and falling into valleys.

The original dwelling is shown on historic mapping dated 1880 and, whilst not listed, is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. Later additions include the attached flat roof double garage with parapet detailing, conservatory, and detached outbuildings within the rear amenity area.

In addition to the rear amenity area, the site benefits from amenity area to the front that includes off-street parking provision, accessed via classified B-road 'Uley Road'. Boundary treatments at the site are predominantly low-level natural stone walls, with sporadic tree and hedge planting seen mostly to the roadside.

The grassland to the east of the dwelling serves an existing public right of way [PROW] 'Uley Footpath 27' that runs parallel to the dwelling; the topography of this neighbouring parcel rises from south to north. The wider topography and low-level boundary treatments at the site



Development Control Committee Schedule 13/06/2023

result in the front, rear and side (east) of the existing dwelling being highly visible to the public in both short and far-reaching views.

The site is within the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty [AONB] and outside of any defined settlement development limits, so is 'working countryside' for planning purposes.

PROPOSAL

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a first-floor extension to the side (above the flat roof garage), alterations to the existing house, new rear terrace & an external car port/battery store to the front.

It should be noted that there is an extant planning permission (S.21/2806/HHOLD) at the site. This permission includes a traditional designed first-floor extension with pitched roof dormers above the garage to the side. A glazed link separates this extension from the main house to provide a visual separation. The permission also includes a large balcony area to the rear elevation and the erection of a modest, detached, battery store outbuilding to the front of the dwelling.

PRE-APPLICATION DISCUSSIONS

Pre-application advice was sought for an earlier scheme and as part of that guidance, officers expressed that the subservience of any extension at the site would be important and that the design and detailing would need to ensure that the proportions of a side extension were appropriate. Furthermore, it was expressed clearly that, given the building line of the site and neighbouring property to the west, plus the open countryside location, a double garage to the front of the house would not respect the appearance of the site and local area and would not therefore be supported.

No meaningful pre-application guidance was sought to discuss the proposed design and scale of this scheme now under consideration.

REVISED PLANS

Following concerns raised by the case officer in February 2023 that the proposed scheme in respect of the design, form, materials, and scale was out of keeping with the original dwelling, a revised scheme was received on 10.03.2023 shown as 'proposed elevations' and 'proposed street side perspective' drawings. These revised drawings were not considered to sufficiently address the concerns raised by officers. Notwithstanding, the revised scheme was considered a marginal visual improvement to the original submission and a full suite of revised drawings were accepted by officers and added to the case file on 17.04.2023.

MATERIALS

Walls: Vertical laid larch cladding

Roof: Standing seam - grey

Doors: Composite - grey

Windows: Composite aluminium- grey

Brise soleil: Wood

Balustrading: Steel and glazing

Decking: Composite



Development Control Committee Schedule 13/06/2023

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

S.22/2203/MINAM for an *amendment to consist of keeping existing garage door to front, omit rear steps and add rear door/ramp to rear of garage* was withdrawn on 17.10.2022

S.21/2806/HHOLD for the *erection of first floor extension, rear terrace and external battery store* was permitted on 03.02.2022

S.19/1307/HHOLD for the *conversion of existing garage into annexe* was permitted on 14.08.2019

S.01/1366 permitted the *erection of new conservatory* on 21.08.2001

S.97/1530 permitted a *replacement double garage and timber shed* on 26.11.1997

REPRESENTATIONS

Statutory Consultees:

Parish Council: *Uley Parish Council Supports this application.*

Contaminated Land: *No comments.*

Biodiversity: *The site comprises mostly hardstanding and an existing dwelling which appears to be in good condition. No preliminary assessment for the potential of the dwelling and other structures on site to support the roosting bats has been provided. On the periphery of the site, there are trees and a small hedgerow, which may provide suitable habitat for common bird species. In the absence of any ecological information or assessment in support of this application, informatives related to birds and baths are [recommended]*

PROW: *The application does not appear to affect the nearby public right of way CUL27, as long as this route remains unaffected, with no changes with the current access e.g. new Gates etc, we offer no objections. [...]*

Public: At the time of writing, 6 public comments of support have been received.

3 supporting comments have been made by residents who live in proximity to the dwelling, the other 3 reside within the Stroud District, distant from the application site. At the time of writing, no public representation has been received from occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling.

The majority of representations received use the same wording and relate to consideration around the potential ecological advantages of the proposed scheme when compared to the approved scheme (S.21/2806/HHOLD). The following is a summary of all comments received:

- The only visible difference between this scheme proposed and the scheme approved is the materials.
- The size of the extension proposed is not different to that which has been permitted.
- Once the timber weathers it will be much less conspicuous.
- The materials to the front do not complement the existing building.
- Contemporary styling will blend well



Development Control Committee Schedule 13/06/2023

- Likely possible for the existing dwelling to be insulated internally to allow for passivhaus aspirations.
- Existing permission does not address ecological factors; the new proposal should allow for passiv design.

NATIONAL AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICIES

National Planning Policy Framework.

Available to view at:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework>

Stroud District Local Plan.

Policies together with the preamble text and associated supplementary planning documents are available to view on the Councils website:

https://www.stroud.gov.uk/media/1455/stroud-district-local-plan_november-2015_low-res_for-web.pdf

Local Plan policies considered for this application include:

CP1 - Presumption in favour of sustainable development

HC8 - Extensions to dwellings.

ES1 - Sustainable construction and design

ES3 - Maintaining quality of life within our environmental limits.

ES6 - Providing for biodiversity and geodiversity.

ES7 - Landscape Character

ES10 – Valuing our historic environment and assets

ES12 - Better design of places.

CP14 - High Quality Sustainable Development.

The Stroud District Landscape Assessment SPG was made in November 2000 and identifies the wider AONB setting affecting the application site as having the 'secluded valleys' landscape type. The SPG is available to view on the Councils website:

<https://www.stroud.gov.uk/media/1070964/stroud-district-landscape-assessment-spg-november-2000.pdf>

The Uley and Owlpen Community Design Statement was made on 15.09.2016 and is available to view on the Councils website: <https://www.stroud.gov.uk/media/182760/uley-and-owlpen-cds-adopted-web-20160916.pdf>

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT

Policy HC8 allows extensions to dwellings and the erection of outbuildings incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling subject to relevant criteria.

The principle of some development at the site has been established as acceptable by the granting of permission under application S.21/2806/HHOLD.



Development Control Committee Schedule 13/06/2023

DESIGN/APPEARANCE/IMPACT ON THE AREA

Richmond Cottage is an attractive, well-proportioned and detailed Victorian property that is positioned close to the B4066 Uley Road in a pastoral setting. It has intricately carved stone walls and a modest horseshoe driveway. It has been extended to the side and rear however these have not interfered with the charming symmetry of the existing house. Although not statutorily protected the building has historical architectural merit and contributes to this part of West Uley.

This current proposal proposes a significantly altered and enlarged scheme when compared with the previously approved extant scheme. The proposal includes:

- A first floor flat roof extension above the existing double garage and secondary 'hallway' area is proposed that would be fully clad in timber.
- The replacement conservatory with single storey rear timber extension and external staircase
- Further groundworks to the rear and small area of walling (to match the existing parapet detailing) proposed adjacent to the existing external staircase (to be retained).
- Balcony/deck connected to retained external staircase.
- A large double carport/outbuilding to be finished in timber and located to the front elevation and to include enclosed bike storage and EV charging area.

Whilst the plot size of the existing property is large enough to accommodate some development without resulting in a cramped or overdeveloped site, the height and scale of the proposed extension and carport/outbuilding are not considered to be appropriately in keeping with the scale or character of the original dwelling and would not appear appropriately subservient. The public comments received have been duly noted; however, it is important to express that the suggestion that all development proposed is no larger or different from that which was permitted is incorrect.

The bulk and scale of the extension proposed is significantly larger and the scheme includes a large double carport/outbuilding to the front of the building which further increases the massing of the development proposed. This would sit forward of the established building line facing the highway and appear out of keeping with the immediate surrounding area. The domineering appearance of the proposed extension is further exacerbated by the lack of any visual break between the proposed new extension and the existing dwelling. The previously permitted scheme, in contrast, allowed for an appropriate visual break with a glazed link to break up the bulk.

Richmond Cottage is explicitly mentioned within the adopted Uley and Owlpen design guide, as being a *Victorian stone house behind an intricately carved stone wall*. The design guide expresses under section 4.9 that *new buildings and alterations need to have regard to the context of the distinctive nature and styles of the particular character area in which they are planned to be sited*. Section 5.2 further expresses that *whilst each proposal should be considered in its specific context [...] extensions to buildings should use similar materials to the original*.



Development Control Committee Schedule 13/06/2023

Given the applicant's comments that the design has passivhaus aspirations, section 5.3 of the design guide is of particular note as it addresses Green Design. The following extracts from that section of the guide are relevant to the proposal:

- *The application of green technology should be as unobtrusive as possible and blend with the architectural character of surrounding buildings and landscapes, avoiding unsightly or unsympathetic appearance.*
- *New buildings or extensions should observe locally distinctive detailing, proportions and scale [...]*
- *Walls of new buildings and extensions should be constructed in appropriate materials. Natural Cotswold stone will 'fit' anywhere [...] In certain locations wood cladding may also be a suitable building material [however] building materials should be chosen to reflect the neighbouring streetscape [...] with particular attention to how (and if) these materials weather and reflect the local stone colour palette and texture.*

The previously approved scheme included rendered walls, wooden doors, wooden windows, and roof tiles to match the dwelling which are appropriately in keeping with the original dwelling and the streetscape. The roof had a low traditional shape with small, pitched roof dormers to break up the length of the extension. In contrast, this scheme proposes timber walling material for all new development.

Public comments received have expressed mixed opinions that the timber proposed does not complement the front elevation and that the choice in material would weather allowing for the extension to be less conspicuous. Whilst it is accepted that some timber at the site would likely be acceptable and that a condition could reasonably be attached to any permission granted restricting the finish of the timber; given the expanse of area that would be finished in the timber, it is not considered that a condition could mitigate the overall visual harm of the timber becoming the predominant finish at the site.

Although Richmond Cottage has been extended to the side and rear, these are set back. This ensures that the well-detailed and well-proportioned original Victorian property is still clearly legible. Paragraph 203 of the NPPF states that 'the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining an application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.'

The proposed first floor extension represents an unsympathetic addition that fails to preserve the proportions and detailing that make the Victorian Richmond Cottage architecturally special. Its block form, with no visual separation finished entirely in timber creates a monolithic block that would dominate the house.

To the front, the proposed car port would also intrude into both the street scene and interrupt the simplicity of the setting of Richmond Cottage when viewed from the road.



Development Control Committee Schedule 13/06/2023

RESIDENTIAL AMENITY

The site is in a rural location, with no neighbouring dwellings to 3 elevations, and ample amenity area separating the host dwelling and the neighbouring dwelling 'Longmead' which is located to the west. As such, it is considered that the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers would be adequately preserved.

PASSIVHAUS DESIGN

Public comments of support refer to the passivhaus aspirations of the proposal. The supporting statement provided, received on 22.02.2023, indicates that the extension is *targeting to be as close to zero carbon as possible and will adopt many passive house principles including an air-tight design.*

Whilst this is noted, the floor plans provided clearly show that the proposed development that the extension would be linked to the existing house and there have been no specific details submitted to demonstrate that the existing historic building, when extended, is capable of allowing for the development to meet those aspirations, particularly in regard to aspirational air-tight design. The supporting statement also suggests that air source heat pumps would be included; however, no details have been provided.

Although the supporting statement indicates that there are aspirations around sustainable construction which broadly align with the Local Plan and the Council's Climate 2030 Strategy aims. The sustainable qualities of an extension to an existing house are limited in the context of these wider strategies.

HIGHWAYS

The proposed development would not alter the existing access and sufficient off-street parking provisions would remain at the site.

PLANNING BALANCE

The property is a very attractive, well-proportioned and detailed Victorian house. There is a 'fallback position' of an extant approved scheme that must therefore be given significant weight. It must be noted that this approved scheme was negotiated to reduce the harm to Richmond Cottage.

Whilst contemporary design can be an appropriate way to extend a traditional building, the extension as proposed in this case is of a scale and form that does not respect the main house and competes with it. This reduces the legibility of Richmond Cottage and would harm its intrinsic detail and charm. The proposed car port and battery store is also of a scale and position that is unsympathetic. This harm is given significant weight.

Whilst the sustainable merit of the proposed extension has much to commend it, it is simply an extension to a much larger home and therefore is given limited weight.

In weighing up these material considerations it is concluded that the harm from the poor design and position of the first-floor side extension and car port/battery store elements of the proposal is sufficient that planning permission should be refused. The proposal is materially



Development Control Committee Schedule 13/06/2023

more harmful than the extant permission and therefore the previous planning permission does not outweigh the design harm.

RECOMMENDATION

For the reasons outlined above, the scheme does not comply with the relevant policies of the 2015 Stroud District Local Plan, or any other material considerations and is therefore recommended for refusal.

HUMAN RIGHTS

In compiling this recommendation, we have given full consideration to all aspects of the Human Rights Act 1998 in relation to the applicant and/or the occupiers of any neighbouring or affected properties. In particular regard has been had to Article 8 of the ECHR (Right to Respect for private and family life) and the requirement to ensure that any interference with the right in this Article is both permissible and proportionate. On analysing the issues raised by the application no particular matters, other than those referred to in this report, warranted any different action to that recommended.

For the following reasons:	<ol style="list-style-type: none">The proposed first floor extension by reason of the scale, design and materials and the detached car port by reason of its scale and position would appear as incongruous, dominating and competitive additions that would be harmful and out of keeping with the existing well-proportioned and detailed Victorian property. As such the proposal would be contrary to policies CP14(5), ES7(1), ES10 and HC8(2) of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan (2015). <p>Informatives:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Article 35 Statement - Unfortunately this application represents a scheme that is contrary to previously provided pre-application guidance and was made without any meaningful pre-application discussions regarding the revised design and scale of the proposal. For the reasons given above the application is recommended for refusal. The applicant/agent has been contacted and the issues explained. Furthermore, the case officer has suggested that the application be withdrawn so that the project can be fully discussed.
-----------------------------------	--