



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 April 2025 by S Indermaur BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/25/3360743

25 Cam Green, Cam, Gloucestershire GL11 5HL

- 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 & Dr Tom & Susanna Price & Martin against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref is S.24/1809/HHOLD.
 - The development proposed is described as a side extension to form kitchen and dining area. Raising the existing ridge level by 1m to be able to convert the roofspace into living space and adding two dormer window to the front elevation.
-

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 proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal building is a modest detached bungalow set well back into its plot and facing the road. It has a gable roof and two forward facing pitched roof ground floor bay windows, flanking a centralised front door. Whilst there is significant variety to the street scene in terms of building type, design and scale, there is a pleasant and simple symmetry to the appeal building's design which contributes positively to the street scene.
5. To some extent, this would be carried into the proposed design, specifically through the use of a pair of forward facing pitched roof dormers above and roughly in line with the ground floor windows and a narrower centralised one. That said, the balance would be upset by the sideways projection of the rear element of the extension. Whilst set back, it would appear awkward and unrelated to the host building through a much larger ground floor opening, its own dormer planted off centre therefrom and a lower eaves height as a result of a balcony. This would result in an asymmetrical design which would lack the coherent qualities of the existing, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.

6. In this regard, the proposal would conflict with Policies HC8, ES12 and CP14 of the Stroud District Local Plan (2015). Together and amongst other things, these policies require the scale, form, layout and design of new development to be in keeping with the original dwelling.
7. Support for the scheme is noted, but it does not absolve me from making an assessment as to its effects in regard to the main issue. There would be benefits, such as views from the balcony and extra space for the family. These would however be mainly private. It is also unclear as to whether the appeal scheme is the sole means to achieve them. They would thus only be worthy of limited weight. Such that they would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have found.

Conclusion and Recommendation

8. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and material considerations do not justify granting permission. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Indermaur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

9. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR