



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 July 2025

by **Martin Andrews MA(Planning) BSc(Econ) DipTP & DipTP(Dist) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/25/3366247

16 Everlands, Cam, Dursley, Gloucestershire GL11 5NL

- 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 M Tattam against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref. is S.25/0028/HHOLD.
 - The development proposed is to replace the single storey rear extension with a rear two storey extension and a dining room extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted to replace the single storey rear extension with a rear two storey extension and a dining room extension at 16 Everlands, Cam, Dursley, Gloucestershire GL11 5NL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref. S.25/0028/HHOLD and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions.
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this Decision;
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building;
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No. Series DT-010- & Plan Nos. 01; 02; 05; 06 & 07;
 - 4) The first-floor windows in the northern and southern side elevations of the extension hereby permitted shall be at least partially obscure glazed and of restricted opening in accordance with details first submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The windows shall thereafter be retained in that form.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal scheme comprises both a single storey and a two-storey extension. The Council has no objection to the former but considers that the latter would be of a size and design that would be out of keeping with the existing dwelling and

harmful to the site's location and wider setting. These objections overlap and can be considered together.

4. I saw on my visit that the appeal dwelling is positioned in a line of large, detached houses in Everlands and on a corner plot at the junction with Riverside, a short cul-de-sac that provides vehicular access to a gated group of houses with a rearward siting to the east of the linear development along the through road. The presence of Riverside results in the rear elevation and the back garden of the appeal dwelling being more visible from the public realm than would otherwise be the case.
5. The proposed extension would be a substantial addition to the original dwelling, albeit the effect would be in part offset by the fact that the ground floor would protrude only 1.9m more into the garden than the existing lounge extension. Furthermore, in terms of any visual impact arising from its size, the full effect would be limited to 'straight on' or direct views of the extension and these are confined to the rear garden of the large dwelling on the other side of Riverside and a small section of that road.
6. Subservience to the main dwelling would be achieved by the ridge of the extension being set well down from that of the existing house; from the proposed hipped roof, and from the width of the two-storey addition being restricted to less than two thirds of the rear elevation. The Officer's report argues that a narrower width is necessary, but although the additional built form at first floor level would be the maximum for the scheme to be acceptable, I consider that, overall, the rear extension would sit comfortably when seen set against the original dwelling from the western end of Riverside. Had the 'straight on' views been more widespread and prominent from the public realm, I may well have agreed with the Council's objection. In addition to objections to the scale of the proposed two storey extension, the Council has also criticised its detailed design, but I can find no fault with this.
7. Finally, Appendix 1 of the grounds of appeal provides photographs of eight dwellings in Everlands that have been extended by additions that would appear to be of a similar, and in a couple of examples greater, proportion relative to the host building. I was able to see some of these on my visit, and whilst I do not have the benefit of the Council's comments, I have no reason to disbelieve that they are valid comparisons. This information has provided a context in terms of the existing character and appearance of the locality for my appraisal of the appeal scheme.
8. For the above reasons I find that there would be no harmful conflict with Policies HC8(2) & CP14(5) of the Stroud District Local Plan 2015 and I shall therefore allow the appeal. A condition requiring matching external materials will secure a harmonious form of development, whilst a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and is in the interests of proper planning. Finally, a condition restricting the form of the proposed first floor side windows will maintain the privacy of neighbours.

Martin Andrews

INSPECTOR