

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2022

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7TH July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/22/3299171

Cress Green Cattery, Cress Green, Eastington, Stonehouse, Gloucestershire GL10 3BG

- 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 Folker against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref S.22/0009/HHOLD, dated 22 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 24 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is for a single storey side extension, with hipped roof and rooflights. Rearrangement of ground floor, and 2 new windows for the proposed study. 3 new dormers to allow for rearrangement of first floor. Rendering of the proposed utility and boot room, as well as the gable wall of proposed bedroom 1.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the area; and upon protected species.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal dwelling comprises a brick built semi-detached house located within a small rural settlement characterised by a loose collection of dwellings of a variety of architectural designs. There is a clear mix of brick, render and painted brick elevations within the locality.
4. The host dwelling includes a gable fronted two storey range, behind which is an inline one and a half storey extension, and then a further single storey projection which demonstrates a clear hierarchy of form when viewed from the south east, south and south west.
5. The dormers would clearly add some built form to the roof of the central element, however in themselves they would be quite modest in their proportions; in addition with the ridgeline and therefore southern roof plane being offset to the north, their overall visual impact would be of a recessive nature notwithstanding the use of render to their cheeks.

6. In terms of the single storey side extension, it would be quite wide although its design and form, including that of its hipped roof, would ensure that it would appear subordinate to the host dwelling, particularly when viewed against the pair of semi-detached houses as a whole. Again, it is proposed to render the elevations of this element of the proposal which would run counter to the brick finished public facing elevations of the existing dwelling, although due to the variety of brick types already used, I consider the use of render would not have been objectionable if I had been so minded to have allowed the appeal. I say this especially due to the application of render panels and sections on brick built dwellings in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site.
7. Therefore, I consider that the proposal would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider area which complies with Policies HC8 and CP14 of the Stroud District Local Plan 2015 (SDLP), together these require the extension of residential properties to be in keeping with the scale and character of the original dwelling and the site's wider setting, with an appropriate design which is respectful of the surroundings.

Protected Species

8. Being of relatively historic construction, I consider that the existing dwelling could provide suitable roosting features for crevice bat dwelling species especially within the roof. I note that the appellant does not dispute such a possibility and whilst I acknowledge that they state that at no point was an ecology report requested by the Council, nonetheless one could have been provided with the appeal submissions.
9. Circular 06/2005 states that the presence of a protected species is a material consideration in development proposals being considered which would likely result in harm to species or habitat. It goes on to say that it is essential that the presence or otherwise of a protected species, and the extent that they may be affected by a proposed development is established before planning permission is granted, otherwise all relevant material considerations may not have been addressed in making the decision.
10. Therefore in the absence of any surveys being provided it is not possible to ascertain the potential impacts of the proposal on bats. Taking a precautionary approach, I consider that planning permission should be refused with the proposal contrary to SDLP Policy ES6 which states that development proposals that would adversely affect European Protected Species will not be supported, unless appropriate safeguarding measures can be provided.

Conclusion

11. Having regard to the above and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal be dismissed.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR