



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 July 2025

by Eleni Marshall BSc (hons) MSc FRICS FAAV MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/D/25/3368202

16 Woodmancote, Dursley, Gloucestershire GL11 4AF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Liam Barclay against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application reference is S.25/0562/HHOLD.
 - The development proposed is extension of existing dropped kerb and creation of a parking space. Installation of an EV charging point.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for extension of existing dropped kerb and creation of a parking space. Installation of an EV charging point at 16 Woodmancote, Dursley, Gloucestershire GL11 4AF in accordance with application ref: S.25/0562/HHOLD and the plans submitted with it subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be commenced before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission;
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site plan: Ref - V1 submitted 21.03.2025, Visibility splay – location view: Ref - V1 submitted 21.03.2025, Location plan: Ref - submitted 28.03.2025 and EV charging plan: Ref - submitted 28.03.2025, and;
 - 3) No construction site machinery or plant shall be operated, no process carried out and no construction related deliveries taken at or dispatched from the site except between the hours 08:00 and 18:00 on Mondays to Fridays, between 08:00 and 13:00 on Saturdays and not at any time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.

Procedural Matters

2. I have utilised the Council's description of the development as per the decision notice as I feel it more concisely describes the development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the impact of the proposal upon the character of the street and the setting of a Grade II listed building and the Dursley Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a Grade II Listed semi-detached dwelling located to the west of Woodmancote within the settlement boundary of Dursley. The proposal would result in the removal of hedging along the frontage of the appeal site and the

utilisation of the area to the front of the property would result in the loss of the front garden feature. The site's listing details, copy provided by the Council, do not make reference to a garden feature or setting albeit this is not necessarily determinative as to the importance of such features in terms of the setting of the listed building or similar.

5. The Conservation Officer comments as to such matters are noted, however, I do not find a hedge (which, as discussed below, could be removed beyond the control of the Council) to positively contribute to the varied character and appearance of the area. The property is noted to benefit from a rear garden and to the front of the appeal site, around the boundary, is an existing hedgerow with a pedestrian gate providing access to the host dwelling with a pedestrian dropped kerb. The site is in the Dursley Conservation Area (CA) as well as affecting a Listed Building which means that the planning (Listed Buildings in Conservation Areas) Act 1990 Section 66(1) and Section 72(1) are of relevance, respectively, in relation to impact on or setting of a listed building and a CA.
6. The proposal is noted to require planning permission for the proposed means of access due to it being onto a classified road (the A4135) and there are several elements to the appeal proposal as noted within the development description in the header of this decision letter. No refusal reason is based upon the provision of an EV charging point and I have no reason to conclude differently on this element. The refusal reason is, therefore, based upon the proposed new vehicular access and dropped kerb with regard to what the Council outline to be the erosion of a traditional garden feature in the context of the character of the street, the setting of the Grade II Listed building as well as the character of the wider setting.
7. At the time of my site visit I found that the front garden is of limited visibility in the context of the existing street scene due to the boundary vegetation and that the garden contributes little to the traditional aesthetic or significance of the host dwelling itself nor the wider CA. Within the immediate vicinity of the appeal site, I found that the street scene is highly varied in terms of property styles, materials, bulk, scale and massing as well as resulting in a combination of both more modern and traditional built form. There is a wide range of building styles, ages as well as boundary treatments and frontages creating a lack of uniformity along Woodmancote. In addition, and within the vicinity of the appeal site there are also examples of parking to the frontages of properties (whether listed or not) meaning that parking of the nature proposed would not be uncharacteristic for the setting.
8. The hedgerow itself, largely screens the appeal site/host dwelling from views with the hedgerow largely being at odds with the wider street scene where buildings are easily legible and unobscured within general views. I find that the proposal would result in an improvement to the appearance of the property frontage compared to its existing condition. I do not find that the removal of the boundary treatment and opening up to provide hardstanding for car parking would be harmful to the site setting of the Grade II Listed building.
9. Whilst the enclosure is noted to provide separation from the street scene and pavement. limited justification, and evidence is before me as to the site enclosure and landscaping contributing strongly enough to the site significance and its architectural and historic character, to warrant its retention and/or resist provision of parking as proposed. Furthermore, and as evidenced by the appellant, the Council have confirmed that permission would not be required to remove the boundary

hedge as well as having confirmed that Listed Building consent was not required as part of the proposals. Based upon the evidence before me I find that the erosion of the traditional garden feature, as referred to by the Council, could largely be lost beyond the control of the Council in the event this appeal failed creating a frontage of similar appearance to the appeal proposal albeit without the ability to park.

10. Based upon the evidence before me, and my site visit, I find that the proposal would not harm the character of the street, the setting of the Grade II Listed Building nor the CA and its wider setting. I find that the proposal would be appropriate, providing parking to the property frontage, in a manner which would not be uncharacteristic for the immediate vicinity and that whilst the frontage would be utilised for parking of a vehicle it would still ultimately retain some landscaping which I find would be finished in a manner which would be higher quality than the existing situation.
11. The proposal would, ultimately, result in works to a listed private dwelling which would secure its future as a designated heritage asset which I consider to be a positive benefit as a result of the proposals futureproofing and evolving the ability of the appeal site to contribute to more modern housing needs. There are no objections from a highway safety point of view and in that regard, I find that the proposed new vehicular access and dropped kerb would not result in the erosion of a traditional garden feature which would erode the character of the street and the setting of the Grade II Listed building.
12. The proposal would also allow better visibility of the Listed Building itself which I find would in turn positively contribute to, and enhance, the character and appearance of the immediate setting and the general street scene. As a result of finding no harm to the designated heritage asset in question, there is no requirement to balance the proposal in the context of public benefits as required by the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (the Framework).
13. The proposal would not have a harmful impact on the character of the wider setting and would be consistent with Stroud District Local Plan 2015 policy ES10 which confirms that proposals will be supported which conserve and, where appropriate, enhance the heritage significance and setting of the district's heritage assets and overall seeks to preserve the historic environment. There is no requirement to consider the proposal in the context of paragraph 215 of the Framework due to a finding of no harm and, furthermore, the proposal would be consistent with paragraph 212 of the Framework which requires that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation albeit, as outlined, I have found no harm to the designated heritage assets in question for the reasons set out.

Conditions

14. The Council has suggested three conditions in the event this appeal is allowed which I have considered and applied as appropriate. A time condition is required in accordance with Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. A condition requiring the development to be in accordance with the approved plans is required to control and define the development which is granted consent and a condition relating to timings for construction site machinery/construction work and deliveries is required in order to prevent an unacceptable level of noise and general disturbance to adjacent occupiers within a residential area during construction.

15. Whilst not a condition – the appellant’s attention is drawn to the informative that the Local Highway Authority has no objection to the above subject to the applicant obtaining a Section 184 licence. The construction of a new access will require the extension of a verge and/or footway crossing from the carriageway under the Highways Act 1980.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed subject to conditions.

Eleni Marshall

INSPECTOR