



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 January 2024 by S Indermaur MRTPI

Decision by L McKay MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th June 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/23/3328246

Badgers Way, Moor Court, Rodborough Common, Stroud, Gloucestershire GL5 5GA

- 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 Matthew Jackson against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref is S.23/0359/HHOLD.
 - The development is described as "The construction of a new glazed front gable and loft conversion/roof works to an existing detached dwelling."
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a 1960's detached chalet bungalow with an additional annex and outbuilding added in the 1980s, constructed from Bradstone blocks with a concrete Pantile roof. There are flat roofed dormers to the front and rear elevation of the dwelling. The property sits in a good-sized plot, on the edge of Minchinhampton Common. A Public Right of Way (PROW) runs alongside rear and side of the plot, and the rear of the property is clearly visible from the PROW.
5. The proposed roof extension would comprise two gables linked by a flat roofed section. The gables would complement the roof form of the existing dwelling and flat roofs are found in the area and are consistent with this age and type of property. The flat roofed link would also be set below the ridge of the main roof. However, the overall form of the roof extension, combining gables and a box style dormer, would add considerable bulk to the rear roof slope and be at odds with the simple form of the existing dwelling. Given the prominence of the rear elevation in public views from the adjacent PROW, this would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

6. Part of the proposal is to change the existing roof materials to slates, which the plans state would cover all pitched roofs. No materials details have been provided for the flat roofed link however, and it is unclear whether it would be possible to use slate on the vertical front face. With appropriate materials, the bulk and visibility of the link section could be reduced, however in the absence of materials information I cannot be certain that this visual impact could be mitigated to an acceptable level. It would therefore be unreasonable for me to require materials details by condition, as it has not been demonstrated that there is an acceptable materials solution available.
7. The proposed front gable would be proportionate to the front elevation and only visible from within the cul-de-sac, therefore it would not harm the character and appearance of the area or the host property. This would not however outweigh the harm identified from the proposed roof extension.
8. For the reasons detailed above, the proposed roof extension would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host property and wider area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CP14 and HC8 of the Stroud District Local Plan (2015) which together state that permission will be granted for the extension of residential properties provided that it is of an appropriate design and appearance which is respectful of the surroundings.

Other Matters

9. I appreciate that the appellant wishes to improve the existing accommodation and insulation and has compromised their design based on officer advice, however the additional roof accommodation would be a private benefit only, and it has not been demonstrated that the additional accommodation is necessary to make the dwelling liveable. Consequently, I give these private benefits minimal weight and they do not outweigh the potential harm identified.
10. I have taken account of the lack of objection from neighbours; however, this is a neutral matter and does not outweigh the harm identified.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Indermaur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and agree with the reasoning set out above. On that basis the appeal is dismissed.

L McKay

INSPECTOR