
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 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: 6 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/20/3259586

9 Folly Lane, Stroud, GL5 1SD

- 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 Mark McTaggart against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref S.20/0691/HHOLD, dated 17 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 18 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Proposed extensions and alterations to existing house together with new garage re-submission of S.19/2217/HHOLD'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons for Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a 1930s detached dwelling set in a long narrow plot. Its architectural style is typical of the era and appeared relatively unaltered, particularly at the front elevation. It is defined by simple lines, modest proportions and a pyramid hipped roof which combine to create a neat, appealing property. It is located at the rise of a hill in a street characterised by a mix of semi-detached properties opposite, detached dwellings to the west of a similar period and relatively modern detached dwellings on the east boundary of the property. I observed a number of dwellings in the immediate area had been altered and extended, some at roof level and to the side.
5. The proposed development would result in a significant remodelling of the property and would include extensions to the side and front as well as at roof level. The modestly sized dwelling would be engulfed by the new extensions and would change the property's appearance on all aspects. It would result in the loss of the attractive pyramid roof and the chimney stack. Whilst the design

would retain the protruding gable at the front elevation, this feature would be unbalanced by the proposed front extension. Furthermore, the front single storey and side two-storey extensions would create an inelegant mass which would wholly extinguish the existing simple profile of the dwelling and would detrimentally alter the existing front building line. As such the cumulative effect of the numerous changes would be harmful to the character and appearance of the dwelling.

6. The changes to the rear would not be visible from public vantage points, and I observed that although the dwelling has an elevated position it did not appear particularly prominent in its setting. However, the development to the front and sides, by virtue of its poor design, would make the dwelling a more prominent and materially less attractive feature in the street scene.
7. Large dwellings are not uncharacteristic of the area, and the proposed small increase in ridge height would not disrupt any strong sense of uniformity in the roofscape surrounding the appeal site. However, these matters alone would not justify extensions which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property.
8. Given my findings it is concluded that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policies HC8 and CP14 of the Stroud District Local Plan 2015 (Local Plan) which collectively require high quality development which protects, conserves and enhances the built and natural environment. There would also be conflict with Local Plan Policy ES12, which whilst supporting development where people enjoy living and provides flexibility for future needs, amongst other matters, also requires development to be well designed which creates high quality successful places.
9. The principle of airspace is supported by the Government, and this is reflected in policies of the National Planning Policy Framework. However, paragraph 118 of the Framework states they should be allowed where development, amongst other matters, is well designed. I have found the proposal would be of an unsympathetic design which would harm the appearance of the host property and therefore, the proposal would be inconsistent with airspace and design policies of the Framework.
10. Policy ES3 of the Local Plan relates to environmental limits which are not matters in dispute in the case and therefore is not determinative in this appeal.

Other Matters

11. The rear garden of the appeal property bounds the grounds of Upper Grange Badbrook, which is a Grade II listed building. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of the listed building or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess. Whilst the host property bounds the grounds of the listed building it is a later addition to the street scene and does not form part of the setting in which the listed building can be appreciated. As such the proposed development would not affect the setting of the heritage asset; it would be preserved.
12. The appellant has stated the proposed alterations are required to address serious health issues, to which I have had regard in reaching this

recommendation. However, it is unlikely that the proposal before me is the only option to achieve the accommodation requirements of the appellant and to improve family accommodation.

13. I note that the proposal follows pre-application consultation with the Council and that the planning officer may have expressed favourable views during the application process; however, the Council has provided clear reasons for refusal, which reflect comments stated in the pre-application advice and which have taken account of development plan policies and other material considerations. As such this matter has had limited weight in reaching this recommendation.
14. The small benefits of improving the overall quality and efficiency of the building's fabric and the proposed use of sustainable technologies would not outweigh the harm identified.
15. I observed examples of roof alterations and extensions in Folly Lane, including at Nos 26 and 18. The appeal property and the neighbouring dwelling are both detached and of a particular character which differs from surrounding properties and the proposed development before me would extend the property to the front. As such these examples are not directly comparable and have had limited weight in this case.
16. The appellant has drawn my attention to the recently adopted permitted development rights in Class AA¹ (Order) which he accepts would not be applicable to the appeal property given its age, and therefore this matter carries little weight in this case.

Conclusion and Recommendation

17. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A J Sutton

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

18. I have considered all the submitted evidence and concur that the appeal should be dismissed

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR

¹ The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) (Amendment) (No.2) Order 2020 Part 1 of Schedule 2 Class AA – enlargement of a dwellinghouse by construction of additional storeys