



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 August 2023

by G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 5 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/23/3323419

12 Shelley Road, Dursley, Gloucestershire, GL11 4QD

- 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 Joshua Turner against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application, Ref S.23/0438/HHOLD, dated 1 March 2023, was refused by notice dated 28 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is a 1.5 storey side extension and single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises of what I would describe as a semi-detached chalet bungalow standing almost at the end of a quiet cul-de-sac within a sizeable residential estate. All the properties leading to the appeal site along Shelley Road from Shakespeare Road are similar in style, and are laid out in open plan form, with the greenery at the front punctuated only by the driveways serving each property. I noted that none of the chalet bungalow had been extended to the side, and the gaps between the pairs contribute to a general local sense of spaciousness. At the end of the cul-de-sac, are some pairs of semi-detached dwellings.
4. The appellants propose a side and rear extensions. The Council has not raised an objection to the proposal at the rear, and I have no reason to either.
5. The appeal property is set at a lower level than the fenced path which runs alongside the appeal property linking the cul-de-sac with Tennyson Road. Between the property's driveway and the fence is a landscaped, grassed bank, which extends to the back of footway at the front. This bank, which for the most part is clearly visible from the highway outside, adds visual relief within this part of the estate and contributes positively to the sense of spaciousness in the corner of the cul-de-sac.
6. Taken in combination, the proposed side extension and the path to be constructed between it and the fence, would effectively obliterate the

landscaped bank alongside the dwelling. This would result in a significant and harmful reduction in greenery and openness in this part of the cul-de-sac.

7. The extension is described as 1.5 storeys, but the first floor is intended to accommodate a sizeable double bedroom and a bathroom. The appellant's attempts at subordination in the design by adopting a lower ridge than the host property is noted. However, the front elevation would be a linear extension of the current building line, with the same eaves level and front roof profile.
8. The extension, to my mind, would imbalance the semi-detached pair and would appear as a bulky and cramped addition in this visual context. The appellant's comments as to the visibility of the proposed extension when approaching along Shelley Road are noted, but in my view, the impact of the proposed extension at the end of the cul-de-sac, when combined with the loss of greenery, would prove obvious and harmful.
9. I therefore conclude that the development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings. Accordingly, a clear conflict arises with those provisions of policies HC8, ES12 & CP14 of the Stroud District Local Plan (LP) directed to ensure that all development and proposed extensions in particular are of an acceptable design quality and appearance, respectful of the surroundings and local area.

Other matters

10. All other matters referred to in the representations have been considered and I have noted the planning history of the site, in particular the outcome of a recent appeal¹ affecting the property. Whilst the history has been material to my considerations it has not attracted significant weight, and this appeal has therefore been determined on its specific merits.
11. The appellant's reference to other developments in the locality regarded as precedents or an inconsistency of approach by the Council has been noted, but these examples do not justify granting permission to a proposal which I have found to lead to harmful consequences.
12. Reference has been made to other development plan policies but those I have referred to are considered the most relevant in the particular circumstances of this case. References to the *National Planning Policy Framework* have also been taken into account.
13. No other matter is of such strength or significance as to outweigh the considerations that led me to my conclusions.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR

¹ Ref: APP/C1625/W/20/3250063, dated 13 July 2020 concerning an addition to the property to create an additional dwelling.

