



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 December 2021

by Oliver Marigold BSc DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/21/3281532

26 Hawthorn Rise, Stroud, GL5 4QW

- 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 Anthony Cameron against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref S.21/0745/HHOLD, dated 22 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is demolish conservatory, construct new 2 storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Although the Council's Plans List did not refer to a side elevation plan (one of two numbered 'P07'), it has subsequently confirmed that this plan did form part of the application and I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies within a residential estate setting where the majority of dwellings are pitched roof two-storey terraced or semi-detached dwellings, set within a reasonably spacious environment. The appeal site is one such semi-detached property and contributes to the uniformity and rhythm of the area through its original form and its simple, unfussy appearance.
5. The site's topography is such that land levels rise steeply away from the rear of the host dwelling. Immediately behind the property's conservatory, a patio area sits within the retaining walls necessitated by the site's levels.
6. At the end of the garden, at a higher level on top of the retained land, there exists what appears to be a relatively new outbuilding. It covers much of the width of the plot at this point.
7. At ground floor level, the patio area provides a degree of space between the dwelling, outbuilding and the plot boundaries. The proposal would infill much of the patio area with single and two storey extensions.

8. Viewed as a whole, and in conjunction with the existing development, the proposal would result in the plot being substantially covered in hard, built form. Although a first-floor balcony is proposed and part of the patio would be retained, there would be little space or relief from buildings within the plot's boundaries at the rear of the site. As a result of the proposal's scale, mass and extent, particularly when combined with the extent and presence of the outbuilding, the site would appear cramped and overdeveloped, causing significant harm to the property's character and appearance.
9. Such adverse effect would be added to by the design of the proposal. While the extensions would be subservient in size to the house itself, when read together the individual parts would have an awkward and disjointed appearance, with competing depths of rear projections and differing roof forms. The proposal's design would not therefore reflect the legible and simple design features of the existing house, significantly harming its character and appearance.
10. I recognise that screening from fencing and existing buildings means that the proposal would not be prominent from the road. I also understand the appellant's desire to increase the internal living space and that no harm to neighbouring properties' living conditions has been identified, but I do not consider that these factors justify the harm identified.

Other Matters

11. Reference has been made to Uriah's Barn, a Grade II listed building, calculated by the appellant as within 50m of the site. Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires the decision maker, in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest.
12. In determining the application, the Council considered that there would be no harm to the listed building or its setting. Given the separation distance and the domestic nature of the appeal site and proposal, I have no reason to disagree in respect of this matter. However, this does not alter my view on the main issue.

Conclusion

13. Although it would not harm the listed building or its setting, the proposal would result in a cramped appearance and have a design that does not reflect that of the existing dwelling, significantly harming the dwelling's character and appearance and that of the wider area. As such, it would be contrary to policies HC8 (1 and 2) and CP14 of the adopted Stroud District Local Plan (November 2015). Reference was also made to a Village Design Statement, but neither party has identified its status or relevance to the appeal and I was not supplied with a copy of this document.
14. Having considered the Development Plan as a whole and all other relevant considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Oliver Marigold

INSPECTOR