The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 May 2021 by A Coombes

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTP

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 June 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/21/3271153
Site Address 45 Crescent Road, Bridgend, Stonehouse, GL10 2AR

- 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 Ryan Morgan against the decision of Stroud District Council.
- The application Ref S.20/2316/HHOLD, dated 28 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 24 December 2020.
- The development proposed is a side and dormer extension including alterations to rear conservatory.

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.

Procedural Matter

3. The Council raised no concerns with the proposed garage to the side of the appeal site nor the alterations to the conservatory, and no cause for disagreement with these conclusions has been found. Therefore, the remainder of this report will focus on the proposed dormer extension.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and area, with particular regard to design, scale, and massing.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. Crescent Road is a residential street, which abuts the Industrial Heritage Conservation Area, and is comprised of semi-detached bungalows on one side and semi-detached two-storey houses on the other. There are two distinct styles of bungalow on the road with the gable end orientated either as the principle or side elevation. The appeal site is of the former style and, though there are similar examples at the start of Crescent Road, it is the first of its design in the immediate vicinity. The proposal seeks permission for a side and dormer extension and alterations to the rear conservatory.

6. The proposed dormer extension would engulf the majority of the original roof form and would be highly visible from the public realm. This would be particularly emphasised due to its prominent position set forward of the building line and neighbouring dwelling at No. 43 Crescent Road, and close to the junction with Crescent Close and Wharfdale Way. Although the fallback position of permitted development is acknowledged, the plans demonstrate a significant mass increase from these limitations. Therefore, and having had regard to the proposed use of materials, due to its size and bulk the proposed development would represent a dominant and disproportionate addition that would not be in keeping with the scale and character of the original dwelling.

7. I recognise that there is some variation in the design of dwellings in the vicinity, but the bungalows on Crescent Road and Crescent Close possess a largely unaltered and unspoilt roofscape, with just one example observed of a dormer extension. The appellant has noted that there is a similar planning application under way for a nearby property. Nevertheless, such extensions are neither a predominant nor characteristic feature of development along the road or in the area. The introduction of such a large dormer at No. 45 Crescent Road would be an incongruous addition to both the semi-detached pair and to the wider street scene.

8. For the reasons outlined above, the proposed dormer extension, by virtue of its design, scale and massing would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host property and area. The development would not accord with policies HC8 and ES12 of the Stroud Local District Plan, adopted 2015. Together these policies ensure that development is of high-quality design and responds well to its context, and that extensions to dwellings are in keeping with the scale and character of the original dwelling.

Other Matter

9. In reaching my decision I have had regard to the personal circumstances of the appellants and the desire for the appeal property to be their *forever home*. However, whilst I understand the appellant's intention, I do not find that this would outweigh the significant harm which I have found would be caused to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The proposal would not accord with the Development Plan when it is considered as a whole. For the reasons given above, I recommend the appeal should be dismissed.

A Coombes

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR