
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 January 2017

by Mike Fox BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19th January 2017.

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/16/3161280

24 Larkrise, Cam, Dursley, Gloucestershire, GL11 5EZ

- 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 D Cross against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref S.16/1247/HHOLD, dated 16 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of single and two storey extensions to dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of single and two-storey extensions to dwelling at 24 Larkrise, Cam, Dursley, Gloucestershire, GL11 5EZ in accordance with the terms of the application Ref S.16/1247/HHOLD, dated 16 May 2016, and the plans submitted with it, 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 materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: *Proposed Plans and Elevations* scale 1:50@A1, Ref CRO/999/PL/02/15/002/C, dated April 2016.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey end of terrace house, situated on a street corner within a residential estate. The Council expresses concerns that the proposed extensions, on a prominent corner property, would be unsympathetic to the simple design and detailing of the host property and be out of keeping with the character and appearance of both the existing house and the area in general.
4. The surrounding estate, which forms the context for this appeal, whilst largely comprising properties with simple designs and detailing, nevertheless contains

several examples of dwellings which have been altered and extended. This has enabled the estate to develop organically and meet the changing needs of households, whilst introducing a level of variation which is not displeasing to the eye and which generally respects the scale, height, form and use of external materials in the area. The design of the proposed development, including its fenestration would not be alien to the host property; its scale would be subservient to it; its height would not exceed the existing roof line; and its external materials would match those of the host property. It is my view that the proposed development, whilst being clearly visible with a two-storey element which protrudes from the side of the house on a corner plot, nevertheless respects the overall design aspects that I have referred to.

5. I therefore consider that the proposal would not be contrary to national policy covering design parameters, as expressed in the *Framework*¹, and that it would also not be contrary to the Stroud District Local Plan policy HC8, which governs extensions to dwellings. In relation to the three criteria in this policy, the proposal would not appear cramped or overdeveloped; its height, scale, form and design would not be out of keeping with the scale and character of the original dwelling; and it would not compromise the Council's Parking Standards.
6. The Council has not suggested any additional conditions to those which appear in the standard questionnaire, and neither do I.
7. In conclusion, I find that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the existing host dwelling or the streetscene and as such it would not be contrary to national policy or the development plan. For the reasons given and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Mike Fox

INSPECTOR

¹ DCLG: National Planning Policy Framework (*the Framework*); March 2012.