



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 August 2022

by **O Marigold BSc DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd September 2022.

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/W/22/3296264

5 Churchfield Road, Upton St Leonards GL4 8AT

- 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 Adam Gilbourne against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref S.21/2887/FUL, dated 6 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 30 March 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of two bed detached dwelling and associated works (C3).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of Churchfield Road.

Reasons

3. Churchfield Road and its surrounding area consists primarily of detached and semi-detached dwellings. A few, such as those to the rear of Shanndon House in nearby The Ash Path, are simple bungalows set in a tandem arrangement. These are positioned behind other dwellings, being accessed via a long drive and with limited external space.
4. However, the predominant characteristic of Churchfield Road itself is of dwellings that directly face the road and are set back behind front gardens. Many are also within large plots, having long rear gardens. Dwellings in Churchfield Road have a variety of designs, but many are chalet or full two storey properties with projecting bays, chimneys and other detailing, providing variety and interest to the street scene. Together, these features give the road a pleasant and reasonably spacious, suburban appearance.
5. The proposal is for a bungalow, positioned behind the host dwelling, together with a garage. The design of the bungalow is simple, using materials that would match the existing property. It would also be discretely located, being small and hidden from the road by the existing two-storey dwelling.
6. However, the proposal would be positioned tight against the plot boundaries, with little space around it, meaning that it would appear cramped and overdeveloped. Furthermore, its backland location behind No 5 means that the proposal would not directly face the road and so would be uncharacteristic of other dwellings in Churchfield Road. The small single-storey scale of the

proposal, and its plain unimaginative design, with little detailing, would also fail to reflect the host dwelling or others in Churchfield Road. For these reasons, its scale, design and layout would appear out of place, including when viewed from nearby properties.

7. I therefore conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of Churchfield Road, contrary to adopted policy HC1 of the Stroud District Local Plan (adopted November 2015), which requires that housing is of a scale, layout and design that is compatible with the character, appearance and amenity of the part of the settlement in which it would be located.

Other Matters

8. The proposal would result in the efficient use of land in a built-up area and the addition of a dwelling to the housing supply. However, these benefits would not outweigh the harm I have identified. The scheme seeks to respond to criticisms of an earlier scheme, and the appellant refers to infill development elsewhere, but I have dealt with the proposal before me on its own merits. I have also noted comments made about the Council's handling of the case, but this has had no bearing on my consideration of the planning merits of the appeal.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above, there would be conflict with the Development Plan, read as a whole. No material considerations have been shown to have sufficient weight to warrant a decision other than in accordance with it. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

O Marigold

INSPECTOR