



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 March 2024

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/24/3337146

12 Churchfield Road, Upton St Leonards, Gloucestershire, GL4 8AU

- 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 Chris McNeil against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref S.23/1453/HHOLD, dated 19 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 9 November 2023.
 - The development proposed was described as "*double storey extensions to both sides and rear and single storey extensions to rear and to front*".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a two-storey side and rear extension and single-storey front and rear extension with front dormer at 12 Churchfield Road, Upton St Leonards, Gloucestershire, GL4 8AU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref S.23/1453/HHOLD, dated 19 July 2023, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drg Nos CM001 and CM002 REV A.
 - 3) The extensions hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the first-floor window on the north-east elevation facing 14 Churchfield Road has been fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of that window that is less than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which it is installed shall be capable of being opened. Once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.
 - 4) No construction site machinery or plant shall be operated, no process shall be carried out and no construction-related deliveries taken at or dispatched from the site except between the hours 08:00 and 18:00 on Mondays to Fridays, between 08:00 and 13:00 on Saturdays and not at any time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Procedural Matters

2. My formal decision uses the description of development that was given on the Council's decision notice and which was repeated by the appellant on the appeal form. This better reflects the full extent of the proposal compared with the description on the original application form and which I have quoted in the banner heading above.

3. The application was amended prior to decision which, according to the officer's report, reduced the width of the proposed side extension to provide a gap with the neighbouring boundary.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and wider street scene.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two-storey, detached gable-fronted dwelling with a single garage attached to one side, and minor single-storey additions to the opposing side and rear. Together with No 10, a similar styled property, it sits behind a deep, open planned frontage including a driveway and lawn. The area is residential in character comprising a pleasant mix of property types and styles, both old and new, with no particular sense of rhythm or uniformity to the overall development pattern. The proposal would include significant modifications to the dwelling including two-storey additions to both sides and to the rear, including a front facing dormer to one side over a new integral garage, with further ground floor extensions to the front and rear.
6. Although the proposal would significantly increase the scale and bulk of the building, I share the Council's view that the plot would be large enough to accommodate the size of the enlarged building without appearing cramped in its setting. The side additions would retain adequate separation with the plot's side boundaries with the building remaining well-set back from the road frontage.
7. The extensions would undeniably result in a marked change to the dwelling in terms of style and appearance. However, my attention has been drawn to a planning permission granted in 2019 (Ref S.19/1942/HHOLD) at No 10 next door for development described as '*Erection of single storey rear, two storey side extensions and porch with canopy to front*'. I am informed that the permission remains extant and have no reason to dispute this assertion. From the information provided to me, it is clear that significant change to the appearance of No 10 has been sanctioned by the Council. This supports my own view that neither of these similar looking properties are particularly sensitive to change having regard to the mixed character of the area. Furthermore, in terms of visual impact upon the street scene, the appeal proposal, without directly replicating the approved scheme at No 10, would bear a striking similarity.
8. The proposed side wings to No 12 would not match each other. Nevertheless, they would both be similar in scale and profile, with hipped roofs pitched at an angle to mirror the pitch of the original roof, and both recessed behind the building's existing façade at first-floor level such that the forward-facing gable would remain standing proud. I am unable to identify any visual harm from the building appearing merely asymmetrical in design by virtue of a small dormer feature to one side and other modest changes. My impression is that the composition of the remodelled dwelling as a whole would be well-considered in terms of proportions, scale, and form, with the extensions appearing as seamless additions that would simply alter the arrangement of the existing building in a comprehensive and unified way.

9. The use of facing stonework, render panels and red bricks, with slate roof tiles, would be a departure from the buff-coloured bricks and concrete tiles of the existing. However, in my assessment they would complement the style of the building and would draw upon the mixed palette of materials within the locality.
10. Overall, I am satisfied that the proposal would be neither harmful to the character or appearance of the appeal property or to the wider area. As such, I find no conflict with Policy HC8 of the Stroud District Local Plan 2015 as far as it requires extensions to dwellings to respect the scale and character of the original dwelling and the site's wider setting and location.

Other Matters

11. I have considered the effects of the proposal upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and concur with the Council's view that due to the size and siting of the proposed extensions, and the relationship with neighbouring properties, there would be no overbearing or overshadowing impact to either adjoining occupier. The officer's report confirms that the side window proposed facing 14 Churchfield Road would serve a bathroom and could reasonably be conditioned to be obscurely glazed. I accept that this would be necessary to avoid any unacceptable overlooking of the neighbour's property.
12. I have noted some comments from interested parties relating to the need, or otherwise, for access to neighbouring land to construct the proposed extensions, and highway matters, but neither of these issues are related to the planning merits of the case.

Conditions

13. A condition specifying the relevant plans is necessary as this provides certainty. I have included a condition as suggested within the officer's report in order to safeguard the living conditions at 14 Churchfield Road.
14. Given the scale of the proposed works, I agree with the Council that a condition is also necessary restricting the days and hours of operation of construction machinery/plant and processes, and in relation to construction-related deliveries to and from the site in order to safeguard the living conditions of nearby occupiers in terms of noise and disturbance.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given, in the absence of any other conflict with the development plan, and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR