
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 September 2020 by A J Sutton BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/W/20/3254747

Green Acres, Selsley Hill, Stroud, GL5 5LP

- 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 Evans against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref S.20/0172/HHOLD, dated 24 January 2020, was refused by notice dated 31 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is a replacement garage building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a replacement garage building at Green Acres, Selsley Hill, Stroud, GL5 5LP, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref S.20/0172/HHOLD, dated 24 January 2020, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
Site Plans Drawing No. 01, Proposed Floor Plans Drawing No. 04 and Proposed Elevations Drawing No. 05.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matter

3. The appeal property is in the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The Council concluded, as it is surrounded by built form in a residential area, the proposed development would not have a harmful effect on landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB. I observed nothing which would lead me to dispute this conclusion.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the dwelling and the street scene.

Reasons for Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a dormer style, rendered detached dwelling in a plot towards the top of Selsley Hill and close to the edge of the settlement. The dwelling is set low in the plot with a small existing garage located at the property's boundary wall which abuts a pavement and the B4066. The wider settlement forms a ribbon of development which edges the road and comprises a mix of residential properties, many of which are of a Cotswold vernacular interspersed by more modern additions.
6. Whilst wider views of the dwelling from the road are limited, the existing garage has a prominent position by the roadside and sits higher than the house. It does not have any particular architectural merit, although its diminutive size and simple form make it appear unobtrusive in the area.
7. The proposed outbuilding would have a larger footprint and be substantially higher than the existing garage. Whilst the ridge height would be somewhat higher than the dwelling, this would in part be as a result of the respective ground levels. The proposal would however be subordinate in scale and not of a disproportionate size to the family sized dwelling it would serve. It would also fit comfortably within the plot. Furthermore, the design of the development has clearly taken cues from the existing simple garage form and would be constructed of locally distinctive materials. In summary therefore I find that the proposed outbuilding would be in keeping with the scale and character of the original building and would not be harmful to its appearance.
8. The wider settlement is characterised by built forms of a variety of sizes and heights with differing external surface materials, set close to the roadside. Although the proposed scale and height of the development would make it a prominent structure in the street scene, the built form, by virtue of its shape, materials and position, would not appear at odds with its setting and the character of the wider area.
9. In light of the above, it is concluded that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the dwelling or the street scene. Accordingly the proposal accords with Policy HC8 of the Stroud District Local Plan 2015 (Local Plan) which states permission will be granted for the erection of outbuildings incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling provided, amongst other matters, the height, scale, form and design of the outbuilding is in keeping with the scale and character of the original dwelling (taking into account any cumulative additions), and the site's wider setting and location.
10. In reaching this conclusion I have noted the planning history of the site including a similar proposal which was refused planning permission. However, in this case, I have found the scheme before me would not conflict with development plan policies for the reasons outlined.

Conditions

11. In addition to the statutory requirement time limiting the consent, the development must accord with approved plans in the interest of character and appearance. A condition has been suggested limiting the use of the garage to that incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse. Such a condition is not necessary because if the building was used for other purposes to this, it is

likely that a separate planning permission would be required. Accordingly, I have not imposed the suggested condition.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons outlined above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

A J Sutton

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and concur that the appeal should be allowed with the suggested conditions.

R C Kirby

INSPECTOR