



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 March 2025

By G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/25/3358897

30 Severn Road, Dursley, Gloucestershire, GL11 6NQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr J Slaney against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref is S.24/1535/HHOLD.
 - The development proposed is described as to extend up on part of the existing single storey extension and refurbish the ground floor into a lounge, gym and toilet.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. The appellant claims that the Council altered the description of the proposal without his agreement. I shall therefore use the description contained in the original application form

Main Issue

3. These are: (a) the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings, and (b) the implications of the scheme for biodiversity.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is an end of terrace dwelling set in a mature residential estate within which terraced housing is a significant built form. To the side of the house is a single storey garage whose footprint extends much further into the rear garden than the original dwelling. The intention is to provide accommodation above the garage in the form of a two-storey side extension, and to add two single storey extensions behind the original dwelling and the extended garage. The front elevation of the proposed side extension would protrude forward of the host property's front elevation by around 1.5m to match the line of the new porch also proposed at the front.
5. In common with others in the terrace, the host property is a modestly sized dwelling, but the principle of extending is accepted in local development plan policy subject to the satisfaction of certain design criteria. The appellant's statement displays an awareness of the local policy provisions, if not an understanding.

6. In this regard the appellant acknowledges that the proposed extension at the side is large in scale but puts this down principally to the presence of the large garage. This may be the case in part, but it does not adequately explain the proposed front protrusion, or the continuation of the terrace's ridge line across the proposed side extension's full width. These features in the appellant's view would enable the extension to achieve visual unity and subservience, providing a 'natural book-end' at the end of the terrace.
7. Traditionally, book ends are not meant to achieve subservience, but to provide a visual frame for the remainder of the terrace. I did not see a single example of a book-end on any nearby terrace in the estate. To my mind, the proposed extension, taken as a whole, by reason of its scale, mass and design would represent a disproportionate addition overwhelming the host property, leading to the creation of a visual intrusion at the end of the terrace in a prominent position. The proposed use of rendering rather than a matching material on the main side elevation would serve only to draw attention to the scale and mass of the development, thus highlighting its intrusive nature.
8. I therefore conclude that contrary to the provisions of design criteria cited in policies HC8 and CP14 of the Stroud District Local Plan (SDLP) the proposed extensions, particularly the side and forward extensions, having regard to their height, scale, form and design would not be in keeping with the host property, the terrace of which it forms a part and the site's wider setting. It would not be respectful of its surroundings.
9. The appellant points to other examples of development in the locality which he claims has similar characteristics to the proposals. I have taken these into account, but having regard to the specific circumstances of this case, they do not persuade me to alter my conclusion on this issue.

Biodiversity

10. The appellant does not dispute that the application was not supported by ecological surveys, particularly in respect of bats, a European Protected Species, and none have been submitted for the appeal. However, the appellant considers the presence of bats to be unlikely, given that in his view the potential for providing a viable habitat for bats is limited. A knowledge of the Bats Conservation Trust's Good Practice Guidance is claimed by the appellant, and a visual inspection of the existing attic space has been carried out, with no bat activity identified.
11. Had the inspection been carried out and verified in writing by a person qualified to do so, I may have been inclined to conclude that the Council's concerns had been addressed and overcome. However, that is not the case, and accordingly, I do not intend to rely on what I regard as anecdotal evidence.
12. I conclude that contrary to the provisions of SDLP policy ES6, inadequate information has been provided in respect of a European Protected Species so that biodiversity issues could be adequately assessed.
13. Since I find against the appellant on the two main issues, the appeal is dismissed.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR

