



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 June 2025 by T Morris BA (Hons) MSc

Decision by Kenneth Stone BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/25/3364105

Annfield, London Road, Stroud, Gloucestershire GL5 2AT

- 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 Richard Jessup against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application reference is S.25/0167/HHOLD.
 - The development proposed was originally described as 'demolition of an existing single storey garage circa 1950's considered to be contemporary to the original house and the construction of an enlarged garage with boy's games room / future home office above'.
-

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 proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site features a detached dwelling situated in an established residential area. The dwelling is two-storey and features a main gable roof and a single-storey extension with a partly mono-pitched roof. The dwellings in the area generally feature spacious rear gardens which are mostly open and free of any substantial structures. Where there are outbuildings, these tend to be small garages and sheds which are clearly subservient to the host dwellings. The open nature of the rear gardens and the subservience of structures therein, as is the case at the appeal site, contributes positively to the spacious character and appearance of the area.
5. I acknowledge that the footprint of the proposed garage would be smaller than that of the existing dwelling and the plot. Furthermore, in my view, the catslide dormer windows and a stepped access would not be harmful in the context of the existing dwelling which already has an extension which deviates from the form of the main dwelling. However, due to the substantial height and bulk of the garage, it would have a dominant and conspicuous presence in the rear garden area. It would be out of keeping with the prevailing nature of outbuildings that presently exist which do not introduce such large structures in the context of height and bulk. Even accounting for its siting within the sloped bank and the trees in the vicinity, it would

nevertheless appear unacceptably tall and bulky. The proposal would therefore be an incongruous feature which would erode the open and spacious character and appearance of the area.

6. The evidence before me indicates that the proposal was submitted following refusal of a planning application for a similar development at the appeal site¹. I understand that the appeal proposal was amended in light of the Council's concerns on the previous application. While I do not know the full circumstances of the previous application, the particular changes to the roof orientation, eaves height, design and materials choices would not be sufficient to assimilate the proposal within its setting, given its unacceptable height and bulk.
7. While I was unable to view the garage at Silver Birch on my site visit, I did observe those at Moreton House and Park View. These are however different as they are sited to the front of their respective dwellings, and they are also single storey. In addition, although the plans have been provided, I have not had the benefit of a site visit for the various planning decisions referred to by the appellant. Consequently, I cannot be sure if the circumstances of those decisions are directly relatable to the appeal proposal. In any case, I have assessed the appeal on its own individual merits and in its site-specific circumstances. Therefore, the examples provided do not justify the harm of the proposal.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would be contrary to Policy HC8 of the Stroud District Local Plan (2015), which requires that the height, scale, form and design of outbuildings is in keeping with the scale and character of the original dwelling and the site's wider setting and location.

Other Matters

9. I recognise that the proposal is sought in relation to the needs of the household, including to store tools securely in a workshop and to provide a children's playroom in the short term and a home office in the long term. I also note the appellant's professional experience in terms of building and conservation. However, these matters do not alter my findings on the appeal overall.
10. The Council's Officer Report states that the proposal would likely have an impact on outlook in relation to neighbouring properties but concludes that due to the land levels of the site and the separation distance and screening between the properties, it is not considered that the proposal would have any detrimental impact with regards to overshadowing or overbearing. These matters did not therefore form a reason for refusal from the Council. I note some neighbours have also raised such concerns, however on the basis of the information before me I agree with the Council that such impacts would not result in significant harm. Whether or not that would be the case, this would not affect the outcome of the appeal overall since I have found that it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above, the proposal would conflict with the development plan. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

¹ Application reference S.24/1660/HHOLD

T Morris

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Kenneth Stone

INSPECTOR