



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2017

by Andrew Dawe BSc(Hons) MSc MPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 3rd November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/W/17/3180182

6 Quietways, Stonehouse GL10 2NW

- 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 Executors and Trustees of M. Deane against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref S.17/0446/FUL, dated 17 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 20 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a detached dwelling with associated parking and access.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

Main issue

3. The proposed dwelling would be located in the existing back garden of No 6 Quietways. That back garden, along with others relating to dwellings on the southern side of Quietways, backs directly on to Elms Road. Those back gardens give that significant stretch of the northern side of Elms Road in the vicinity of the site a distinctly spacious and open character despite the presence of rear boundary screening. This is also despite the dwellings at Nos 8, 9 and 10 Quietways being closer than others to Elms Road.
4. The southern side of Elms Road in contrast comprises a variety of designs, types and positions of buildings, at varying distances from the road, which have accesses directly from it. This includes some new townhouses side on and very close to the road, a short distance from the site to the south-east. However, the contrasting nature of development on the southern side of the road does not deflect from that distinctly and pleasantly spacious and open back-land character on the northern side in the vicinity of the site.
5. I acknowledge that solely in terms of the relationship with No 6 there would be an adequate degree of separation between the two dwellings and that both properties would have an acceptable, albeit modest sized, garden space. Furthermore, the proposal's height, with the second storey partially within the

- roofspace, would reduce its massing effect to some extent and its design would not be at odds with the varying designs of other development in the vicinity.
6. Nevertheless, and importantly, the proposal would introduce a new two storey dwelling into a prominent fairly central position within that existing row of back gardens. It would also be relatively close to the road compared with the Quietways dwellings and clearly fronting onto Elms Road, including provision for vehicular access. For these reasons, it would also not appear as an ancillary or subservient feature in relation to the existing dwelling at No 6. As such, the proposal would stand out as an uncharacteristic, jarring and dominant addition to that side of the street, so as to materially detract from its existing spacious and open nature.
 7. The appellant refers to the potential for an outbuilding to be built as permitted development, claiming that this would have the same effect as the proposal. However, I have not received any substantive supporting evidence to demonstrate that this would be the case, especially as any such building would inevitably be seen as relating to the existing dwelling as an ancillary structure. It would also be restricted to a single storey building with a maximum height noticeably lower than that proposed. I have also received no substantive evidence to indicate any firm intention to construct such a building were this appeal to be dismissed. I therefore afford this factor little weight as a potential fall-back position.
 8. For the above reasons, the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such, it would be contrary to policy HC1 of the Stroud District Local Plan which, amongst other things, requires proposed housing to be compatible with the character and appearance of the part of the settlement in which it would be located.

Planning balance

9. The National Planning Policy Framework sets out that there should be a presumption in favour of sustainable development and indicates that to achieve that, economic, social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously through the planning system.
10. The proposal would have the benefit of adding to the local supply and choice of housing in a sustainable location in terms of access to services, facilities, amenities and employment opportunities to serve day to day needs of prospective residents. In resulting in two houses, No 6 and that proposed, with modest sized gardens, this would provide greater choice to those people seeking a property with lower external garden maintenance. It would also have the potential to create short term construction jobs and support for businesses providing locally sourced building materials. In the longer term the prospective residents would be likely to provide additional support to local services, facilities and businesses through patronage and spending.
11. However, these benefits would only be small due to relating to just a single additional dwelling. As such they would be insufficient to outweigh the unacceptable harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It would therefore not be a sustainable form of development.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, and taking account of all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew Dawe

INSPECTOR