
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 December 2016

by Richard S Jones BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 16 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/W/16/3156021

Plot 3, land to the south of Cambridge Retirement Home, Dursley Road, Cambridge GL2 7AB

- 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 G Bolton, GTB Homes Ltd, against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref S.16/0968/FUL, dated 29 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of an incidental outbuilding, Plot 1, land to the south of Cambridge Retirement Home, Dursley Road, Cambridge.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site forms part of a recently completed residential development comprising three bungalows fronting onto Dursley Road. The site sits between the rear garden area of plot 3 and a paddock area beyond and is presently occupied by a detached building with two double width garage doors facing out onto a relatively large expanse of hard surface area serving the three bungalows.
 4. Whilst the appellant states that the proposed building would add a very modest amount of additional built form by being 700mm higher than the existing, this difference is material in the circumstances of this case. The present building, although wide, does retain a clear subservient relationship with the bungalow as an ancillary outbuilding. This is achieved primarily by being noticeably smaller and having the appearance of a garage. This would contrast with the appeal proposal, which would have a similar height to the bungalow and would introduce a first floor level and a number of domestic features such that its appearance would be akin to a coach house style building.
 5. Although it would still be visually read in connection with the bungalow, it would no longer achieve a subservient relationship with the same and would appear disproportionately large and would compete with the relatively modest scale of the bungalow. As a consequence the building would be unduly
-

dominant and would fail to relate to the bungalow as an ancillary building, thereby detracting from its setting.

6. Even though the building would not be particularly prominent in the wider area it would be clearly seen from the access to the adjacent field onto Dursley Road and from the two other bungalows. Planting could in time help mitigate views from Dursley Road, nevertheless, I do find that the proposal would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the locality.
7. I agree that the development would not result in conflict with the first of the criteria of Policy HC8 of the Stroud District Local Plan (LP) in that it would not result in a cramped overdevelopment of the site. However, for the above reasons, the proposal would conflict with the second criterion of LP Policy HC8, which relates to the height, scale, form and design of the outbuilding being in keeping with the scale and character of the original dwelling, and the site's wider setting and location.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters before me, I dismiss the appeal.

Richard S Jones

Inspector