



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 July 2020

by Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/W/20/3250063

12 Shelley Road, Dursley GL11 4QD

- 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 and Mrs J Turner against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref S.19/1936/FUL, dated 16 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as erection of attached dwelling, alteration to existing access and associated works. Resubmission S.19/0881/FUL
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council's decision notice refers to the 'adopted Stroud Local Plan (November 2019)'. However, the Council has confirmed that this is an error and the refusal reasons should refer to the Stroud District Local Plan 2015 (LP).

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The site is part of the garden to 12 Shelley Road (No 12) and contains a car port and garage. There are both single storey and 2 storey properties in the vicinity of the site, but most dwellings are semi-detached, including No 12. Despite some extensions, the gaps to the side of properties largely remain and so the area displays a strong regular pattern of pairs of houses with space in between. The nearby substation disrupts this pattern but it is a small site and so has limited influence on the character of the wider area.
5. The proposed dwelling would be in a cul-de-sac and would follow the established building line. Nevertheless, it would be clearly visible from Shelley Road, from nearby properties and from an adjacent walkway and so would have a noticeable impact on the street scene.
6. The proposal would be taller, wider and bulkier than the car port and garage and so would noticeably erode the site's openness. The proposed house would be similar in appearance to No 12 but the resulting row of terraced units would be incongruous amongst the predominant semi-detached properties. Also, as it would be nearer to the side boundary the development would have a more

dominating effect than the existing house on the adjacent walkway. Through a combination of these factors, the proposal would appear uncharacteristically cramped and would fail to integrate sensitively with its surroundings.

7. Unlike the addition at 14 Shelley Road, the proposal would look like a dwelling rather than an extension by virtue of its similarity in appearance to the nearby houses and the inclusion of a front door. Moreover, the proposal would be different to the development on the corner of Tennyson Road which is a detached dwelling set well away from the roadside boundary. As such, these other developments do not provide justification for allowing the appeal.
8. While the design has been revised with the intention to address concerns, for the above reasons I conclude the proposal would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, and in this regard, it would be contrary to policies HC1(4), CP14 (5) and (9) and ES12 of the LP as well as the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). These all aim, amongst other things, to ensure development is sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters and Conclusion

9. The proposed dwelling would be located in a town and future occupiers would have good access to a range of facilities. Also, the proposal would be acceptable in terms of the amount and quality of accommodation to be provided and effects on the living conditions of occupiers of other residences. Acceptability in these regards is a neutral factor rather than a benefit to which I attach positive weight.
10. The proposal gains support from the Framework in that it would represent a small sized development that would help boost the supply of housing. However, the modest benefits of a single new unit do not outweigh the harm identified in respect of the main issue.
11. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and material considerations do not lead me to a decision otherwise. Consequently, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathan Edwards

INSPECTOR