
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2025

by **R J Redford MTCP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/24/3355687

The Manse, Alkerton, Eastington, Gloucestershire GL10 3AA

- 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 Sam Dauncey against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref is S.24/1264/HHOLD.
 - The development proposed is the erection of domestic outbuilding.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a large plot with a detached 2-storey dwelling and a series of smaller outbuildings within it. The site is set back from the road behind other residential properties. To the rear are open fields with public rights of way (PROWs) across them which have clear views of the appeal site.
4. The proposal would demolish one of the outbuildings and replace it with a 3 bay garage and workshop with office above. It would be finished with a brick plinth and timber boarded walls with a tiled roof and external stairway. Although it would have a similar footprint to the previously refused schemes, it would be less bulky than those iterations. The proposed 1.7m in height between it and the host dwelling would ensure a level of subservience. And its form, proportions and design are not uncommon for a domestic outbuilding, as shown within the planning permissions identified by the appellant within their statement of case¹.
5. However, due to the location at the back of the site, it would be highly visible from the PROWs and wider local area when viewed from the rear. As it would be viewed in context of the gable end of the host dwelling, its narrower elevation, it would be overly dominant in these views. This would unbalance the visual hierarchy of buildings within the site and therefore harm the character of the host dwelling.
6. The appellant has expressly stated that the demolition of the other outbuildings on the site do not form part of this scheme. Therefore, in combination with these structures, the proposal would also create an over-developed and cluttered

¹ S.20/2095/FUL; S.21/2829/HHOLD; and S.22/2520/HHOLD.

frontage which would enclose the host dwelling, thus harm it's overall setting and appearance.

7. That a hedge between the appeal site and fields behind has been laid is noted. However, this will take a considerable amount of time to mature and if deciduous would only provide screening for part of the year. There is also nothing before me to ensure the long-term maintenance and retention of that hedge.
8. Consequently, although an improvement to previous schemes², the location of the proposal in combination with the existing number of outbuildings, would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling. Therefore, it would fail to comply with the Stroud District Local Plan Policies HC8 and CP14, and Eastington Neighbourhood Plan Policy EP7, insofar as they require development to respect the character of the host building.

Other Matters

9. It has been identified that the appeal site is within 50m of the Grade II listed building 'Alkerton Cross House' (Reference 1268396) (the LB). Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended, requires that I have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings as heritage asset. The Council concludes that the setting of the LB will not be harmed due to the intervening distance between it and the appeal site. There is nothing before me to conclude otherwise.
10. No harm has been also identified in relation to the living conditions of neighbouring occupants and highway safety. However, a lack of harm cannot, by definition, weigh for or against the proposal.
11. It is appreciated that the proposal would assist the appellant to continue their hobby, however this does not alter the planning merits of the case.
12. The planning application associated to this appeal was submitted post 2 April 2024 therefore the Biodiversity Net Gain Regulations must be applied. However, as householder development³ this scheme would be exempt.
13. That the appellant understood pre-application advice to be positive which therefore informed their decision to purchase the appeal site, is noted. Nevertheless, pre-application advice constitutes the individual professional opinion of the planning officer, and a Council is not bound to accept the pre-application recommendations.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan when read as a whole and there are no sufficiently weighted material considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, which would indicate a decision otherwise. The appeal is, therefore, dismissed.

RJ Redford

INSPECTOR

² S.22/0321/HHOLD (appeal APP/C1625/D/22/3311113); and S.23/1688/HHOLD.

³ as defined under Article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)