
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 September 2019

by Stuart Willis BA Hons MSc PGCE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/W/19/3234185
27 Marment Road, Cam GL11 6LA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs P Chenhall against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref S.19/1066/OUT, dated 16 May 2019, was refused by notice dated 17 July 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of 1 no. bungalow.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Outline planning permission is sought with the matters of access, scale and layout to be determined. I have had regard to the details provided in relation to these matters but have regarded all other elements as illustrative. Matters of appearance and landscaping are reserved for subsequent consideration. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. While there are examples of staggered building lines, properties in the row are set back from the road. The proposed dwelling would be considerably further forward than any others in the row. There are properties in the area of a similar orientation, footprint and with a comparable overall garden size to that proposed. Nevertheless, the proposed dwelling would be in very close proximity to both the front and rear boundaries with a tapering side garden. This layout is not typical of the residential properties nearby. While the dwelling would be detached, and I note reference to housing density in the area, the plot would have a cramped appearance. This would be at odds with the more spacious pattern of development that is prevalent in the surrounding area.
5. The ridge height of the proposed property would be subservient to the adjacent dwellings and it is indicated that the frontage hedge would be retained. Notwithstanding this, although the property would be seen with the adjacent properties close by, the incongruity of the dwelling's position and its

constrained plot depth would be obvious in views along the street as well as from the allotments and the lane behind the site.

6. There are some low level semi-permanent structures within the allotments. However, the allotments are generally open and add to the greenery of the area. Developments at Cam Pitch would be seen in a different context to the appeal scheme being some distance from the site. From the details before me, the proposed properties at Woodfield Road would have a similar building line to the others in that row. Therefore, these other schemes would not be directly comparable to the one before me.
7. Even if the dwelling were to take design cues and materials from nearby properties, the scheme would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. It would fail to comply with Policies HC1, CP8 and CP14 of the Stroud District Local Plan. These, among other things, seek developments of all scales to have a layout, design and appearance that is compatible with the character and appearance of the site and its surroundings.

Other Matters

8. Being for only one dwelling the contribution of this windfall scheme to housing supply would be very limited. While there is positive support for the provision of affordable and self-build housing in national policy, in the absence of a legal agreement there would be no mechanism to secure the property as such. Even if I were to agree with the appellant that the scheme is an efficient use of previously developed land, any associated benefits from this would not outweigh the proposal's harm to the character and appearance of the area.
9. The site is located within a settlement with access to facilities and services and the Council have not included refusal reasons in relation to matters other than that of the main issue. However, the lack of other harm is a neutral factor.
10. While I note there were no objections from third parties or consultees, a lack of opposition or support for a proposal in itself is not a ground for refusing or granting planning permission unless founded upon valid planning reasons. The proposal has been amended from the previous appeal¹ at the site. However, I have found harm arising from the scheme before me.
11. Overall the benefits of the proposal do not outweigh the harm I have identified and the conflict with the development plan policies, which I consider not to be out of date. While aligning with aspects of local and national policy, the harm to the character and appearance of the area would conflict with the environmental objective of achieving sustainable development.

Conclusion

12. For the reason given above, and taking account of all other considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Stuart Willis

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/C1625/W/17/3180719