



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 May 2025

By G Powys Jones MSc FRTPi

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/25/3362400

Cotswold View, St John's Road, Slimbridge, Gloucestershire, GL2 7DB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission under section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for the development of land carried out without complying with a condition subject to which a previous planning permission was granted.
- The appeal is made by Mr Peter Guiver against the decision of Stroud District Council.
- The application Ref is S.24/1990/VAR.
- The application sought planning permission for proposed front and rear extensions, alterations to roof and additional roof windows, external insulation, and proposed garage without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref S.22/2033/HHOLD, dated 23 November 2022.
- The condition in dispute is condition 2 imposed on the permission which states: *The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in all respects in strict accordance with the approved plans listed below:*

Site Location Plan of 15/09/2022

Proposed Block Plan of 16/11/2022
Plan number = 2205GVR.101 A

Proposed site plan of 16/11/2022
Plan number = 2205GVR.05 A

Proposed floor plan of 16/11/2022
Plan number = 2205GVR.06 B

Proposed Elevations of 16/11/2022
Plan number = 2205GVR.07 B

Section of 16/11/2022
Plan number = 2205GVR.08 B

Proposed Garage Elevations of 16/11/2022
Plan number = 2205GVR.09 B

- The reason given for the conditions is: *To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and in the interests of good planning.*
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for proposed front and rear extensions, alterations to roof and additional roof windows, external insulation, and proposed garage without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref S.22/2033/HHOLD, dated 23 November 2022 at Cotswold View, St John's Road, Slimbridge, Gloucestershire, GL2 7DB in accordance with the terms

of the application, Ref S.24/1990/VAR, subject to the conditions set out in the accompanying Schedule.

Preliminary matters

2. The appellant initially obtained planning permission in 2022 for various alterations and extensions to his property, and the erection of a garage in the front garden. He now wishes to vary some of the approved plans, garage apart, and fresh plans were submitted.
3. The appellant has made an application for costs against the Council. This is the subject of another decision.

Main Issue

4. This is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and its surroundings.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached dwelling. It has been extended before - a two storey extension to the side. The unimplemented 2022 permission was issued following negotiation between the parties, which resulted in the originally submitted proposals being amended. The appellant now seeks to vary the plans so as to go some way towards replicating the form of the original 2022 submission.
6. The main changes proposed as they affect the public realm are an increase in the width of the projecting gable feature at the front of the property and an increase in height of its ridge, and that of the ridge of the rear protrusion. The roof pitch of the gabled features front and back would also increase. Some new rooflights would be installed.
7. St John's Road is the main road serving the village, but outside the site it has but a single footway which is on the same side of the road as the appeal property. From the front, the approved garage when built would screen much of the dwelling when viewed from the footway. The enlarged gable would be seen through the driveway entrance, but having regard to the scale of that already approved, I do not consider that the proposed changes would prove particularly noticeable or objectionable to the passing pedestrian.
8. It is when approaching the site from either side along St John's Road that any new development would be most noticeable since it would be in view for longer. The new roofscape, in particular, would be clearly apparent above hedges and other structures which screen the lower part of the dwelling.
9. The Council regard the revised proposals as objectionable principally because the increased width of the proposed front gable taken in combination with the increased ridge height to the front and rear gabled protrusions would visually dominate the host property. The amended roof form, which the Council considers overly dominant, would be prominent in the street scene, harming local character and the surrounding's appearance.
10. I saw several examples of gabled features on the front of dwellings as I travelled along St John's Road from the A38, so they are not unusual features. However, as exemplified by the 2022 permission, the Council has no objection to gables in

principle. It is the enlargement of the front gable and its increased ridge height which most concern the Council.

11. My assessment is directed to whether the amendments sought would give rise to harmful consequences when compared with the scheme already approved. In my view, it is an inevitable consequence of the unexpired 2022 permission that the overall massing and form of the property would alter significantly and become more noticeable in the public realm.
12. The changes proposed to the approved scheme, including the increase in the ridge height sought, at around 800mm, would not in my opinion be such as to prove objectionable, having regard to the changes which would occur if scheme already permitted were implemented. This is particularly the case having regard to what would be seen when approaching the site from both directions along the main road. I note that no objection was raised to the rooflights, and I have no reason to object.
13. I therefore conclude that the amendments sought to the approved scheme would not have such an effect on the host property or its surroundings as to render them objectionable taking account of the effects of the approved scheme. Accordingly, I find no material conflict with those provisions of policies HC8 and CP14 of the Stroud District Local Plan (SDLP) related to design under whose terms the original scheme was found acceptable.

Other matters

14. All other matters raised in the representations have been considered, including the references to the *National Planning Policy Framework*. I have also considered the comments made by the Parish Council and a local resident, the occupant of the adjacent dwelling, the White House. The latter's concerns are assessed in the Council's officer report and having assessed the matters of concern closely on the site, I have no reason to disagree with the Council's view.
15. No other matter is of such strength or significance as to outweigh those considerations that led to my conclusions.
16. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed, subject to conditions, which shall be the same as those imposed on the original permission, subject to the variation of the approved plans' references.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF 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: location plan and Drawing Ref: 2205GVR.21; 2205GVR.22; 2205GVR.23; 2205GVR.24 & 2205GVR.09 B (Garage Elevations).