



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: 16 July 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/W/20/3250810

**Land at Oldends, Oldends Lane, Stonehouse, Stroud, Gloucestershire
GL10 3RJ**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant permission in principle.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Allen Wilkins against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref S.20/0094/PIP, dated 8 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as permission in principle for a residential development up to 9 dwellings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and permission in principle is granted for a residential development comprising of a minimum net 1 dwelling and a maximum net 9 dwellings on Land at Oldends, Oldends Lane, Stonehouse, Stroud, Gloucestershire GL10 3RJ in accordance with the terms of application Ref S.20/0094/PIP, dated 8 January 2020.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the development in the header above is taken from the application form. However, the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) explains that any decision notice granting permission in principle must indicate the amount of residential development expressed as a range. Accordingly, I have amended the description in my decision to refer to a minimum and maximum net number of dwellings. I have assessed the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The appeal seeks permission in principle in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) (Amendment) Order 2017. As such, I am restricted to considering issues relevant to the location, land use and amount of development. In light of the Council's refusal reasons, the main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area having regard to the site's location and the amount of proposed development.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a dwelling called New House and its large back garden. Two other residences adjoin the site with more dwellings at the other end of Oldends. Also, large industrial and commercial buildings are nearby and so the area has a diverse character and appearance.

5. The site is large and clearly capable of accommodating more dwellings than the single house it currently contains. Given the variety of local building styles and the absence of a uniform layout, the proposal would not be incongruous even if it includes smaller units positioned close to each other. As such, the proposal could be designed so as to not appear uncharacteristically cramped.
6. The site's contribution to the character of the area is limited as it is set away from main roads and partially screened by buildings and vegetation. Consequently, the loss of the site's openness caused by the proposal would not be widely apparent. Furthermore, the development would adjoin and be seen with a number of other buildings and so would integrate with its surroundings.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the area having regard to its location and the amount of development proposed. As such, in this regard, it would accord with policies HC1, CP8, CP14 and ES12 of the Stroud District Local Plan 2015 and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). These aim, amongst other things, to ensure development is sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

8. The Council claim that there is no overriding need for further residences but the Framework's five year housing land supply target is expressed as a minimum and there is no policy that precludes additional development over this figure. The removal of trees, industrial noise effects, the adequacy of the vehicular access and the implications of increased traffic have been raised as potential issues with the proposal. However, the evidence indicates that such matters could be satisfactorily addressed at the technical details consent stage. The proposal could be designed so as to cause no overlooking of any residence.
9. The proposal would increase the number of dwellings and so would be a more efficient use of land. It could be designed to achieve an appropriate density having regard to the constraints of mature vegetation and proximity of industrial properties. There is no policy requirement for the development to include affordable housing. Consequently, none of the other matters raised override or affect my conclusions on the main issue.

Conditions and Conclusion

10. Despite the Council's suggestions, the PPG¹ states it is not possible for conditions to be attached to a grant of permission in principle. Therefore, I conclude the appeal shall be allowed as set out in my decision above.

Jonathan Edwards

INSPECTOR

¹ Planning Practice Guidance, Paragraph: 020 Reference ID: 58-020-20180615 revision date 15 06 2018