



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 November 2021

by Morgan Howell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: Friday 10 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/21/3283383

21 Westfield, Dursley GL11 4EP

- 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 K Clark against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref S.21/1228/HHOLD, dated 11 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as a domestic outbuilding with associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a domestic outbuilding with associated works at 21 Westfield, Dursley GL11 4EP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref S.21/1228/HHOLD, dated 11 May 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Plan and Location Plan A100, Proposed Layout A102, Proposed Outbuilding and Detailed Floor Plan A103 Rev A.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my site visit, the outbuilding had been erected in the position indicated on the proposed drawings. Notwithstanding what has been erected on site, my determination of the appeal has been based on the drawings submitted.
3. I have taken the description of development from the Council's Notice of Decision. The Council has submitted evidence of a formal agreement to a change of description, and it is consistent with that outlined on the Appeal form. I am satisfied that there would be no prejudice in this respect.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the area.

Reasons

5. Westfield is a steep sloping residential street with predominately detached two storey dwellings with a brick and render finish. The dwellings are, for the most part, higher than the road with a notable setback providing generous parking and front garden areas. However, the building line and house types are varied, resulting in some dwellings being closer to the road than others. 21 Westfield is a large detached two storey dwelling, which has recently been extended to the front at first floor. It maintains a similar building line to the neighbouring dwelling at 22

Westfield, but both 19 and 23 Westfield are slightly forward of the appeal site with additional gable projections that extend closer to the road.

6. The proposal would be a detached outbuilding to the front (right hand side) of the main dwelling. The outbuilding would be orientated so the end elevation fronts the road. The building would have a shallow pitched roof and would be finished in a grey painted timber.
7. Aside from the elevated siting close to the road, the proposal has a scale, single storey height, design and finish that is typical of a modern residential outbuilding. The orientation of the building in combination with the design and finish reduces the scale, massing and visual impact from directly outside the appeal site. Consequently, the outbuilding would be in keeping with the scale and character of the original dwelling. Despite its siting close to the road, the varied building line and gable projections present on No 19 and 23, enable the building to successfully integrate with its surroundings. Furthermore, the steep slope of the road coupled with neighbouring front enclosures and landscaping limit wider views of the building.
8. I, therefore, conclude that the siting, design and scale of the proposal would be appropriate and the impact upon the character and appearance of the host property and the area would be acceptable. Accordingly, it complies with Policy HC8 criterion 2 and Policy CP14 criterion 5 of the Stroud District Local Plan 2015, which require outbuildings to be in keeping with the scale and character of the original dwelling as well as being respectful of its surroundings.

Conditions

9. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance.
10. As the outbuilding has already been implemented, it is not necessary to require a condition to implement the consent within the standard time period. However, it is necessary in the interests of precision and clarity, to define the approved plans for the scheme.
11. I have had regard to the suggested condition requiring the building to be used for only domestic purposes incidental to the dwelling. However, there is no evidence before me of what harm would arise from the use of the building for additional living accommodation or a small-scale business use that would not in itself require planning permission. As such, the condition fails the test of being necessary to make the development acceptable.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above and taking into account the development plan as a whole and all other relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Morgan Howell

INSPECTOR